

[The President]

[12th March 1923]

each of the following main demands, viz., Land Revenue, General Administration, Education (non-European), and Civil Works—transferred portions, and two and a half hours as the maximum for motions affecting each of the other demands.

“Neither the rules nor the standing orders prescribe any time-limit for the speeches to be made at this stage. I have, however, following the precedent of previous years, resolved to fix 10 minutes as the time-limit for an hon. Member who moves the omission or reduction of a grant or of an item of a grant, and also 10 minutes for the hon. Member of the Government who has to answer the motion; all other hon. Members will have 5 minutes each. I shall enforce the time-limits strictly: and I appeal to hon. Members to help me to do so.

“Hon. Members will see that, under rule 29 (3), at the close of the nine days allowed for the purpose, it will be my duty to put forthwith every question necessary to dispose of all outstanding matters in connexion with the demands for grants.”

VI

MOTIONS ON THE BUDGET FOR 1923-24.

DEMAND I—LAND REVENUE.

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“Sir, I beg to move for a grant of 252.90 lakhs under Demand I. Land Revenue Department. The various items which go to make up this demand will be found on page 3 of the printed list of demands already in the hands of hon. Members of the House.”

MOTION No. 1.

Mr. A. T. MUTTUKUMARASWAMI CHETTIYAR:—“Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move:

The allotment of Rs. 4,800 for special pay of four deputy collectors at Rs. 100 a month be omitted from the land revenue charges.

“In my speech during the general discussion of the Budget, I said that there was no need for special allowances or special pay. The regular pay which officers, like deputy collectors, receive is high enough in all conscience. When they are put on special duty they are exempted from ordinary duty, and the special work they do is part of the day's work for which they are paid. In these circumstances there is no reason for giving any special pay, and there is no justification for it. I am aware that the hon. the Finance Member has said that the whole question of special pay and travelling allowances is being investigated by the Retrenchment Secretary, the hon. Mr. Moir; but we cannot wait till the whole report or the whole scheme is ready. In the meantime so much of public money will be spent, which may well be saved and used for better purposes. And, anyhow, retrenchment should begin somewhere and at some time or other. I propose that we begin our proceedings this session with applying the pruning knife to the special pay of Rs. 4,800 for Deputy Collectors included in the land revenue charges.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“Sir, as this is the first motion relating to the
11-16 a.m. elimination of allowances which have euphemistically, may I say,

12th March 1923] [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

been designated as 'our old friend', and which the House is nevertheless anxious to eliminate, I may be pardoned if I enter into a somewhat detailed discussion of this question at this stage in order that hon. Members of the House, after hearing me, may make up their minds to postpone the consideration of all questions relating to allowances and withdraw their motions.

"It will be within the recollection of the House that during the Budget discussion of March last some prominence was given to the question of allowances in general. A number of motions had then been tabled, a few of them were discussed and passed, a few more were discussed but not pressed to division, and the rest withdrawn. I am aware that, in not pressing them to division or in withdrawing them, the House had expected that their attitude in the matter having been made known Government would take the necessary steps for translating it into action. The immediate result of some of the cuts in the allowances which had been sanctioned in March last was the automatic elimination of these allowances. Some officers had to be deprived of the allowances, while others holding similar or like positions continued to enjoy them. This unfortunately brought about an anomalous position. Those officers who were deprived of the allowances not only memorialized to Government that the allowances might be restored in common with the rest of their brethren who still continued to enjoy them, but they also asked that if Government could not find their way to do so they might be sent back to those posts which they, under their cadre, were entitled to hold. But it became impossible to comply with either of the requests, and as an inevitable consequence these officers still continue to hold their special posts. But I may assure the House that it has produced a certain amount of irritation and discontent in their minds. These allowances, Sir, are granted some in the city of Madras and some in the mufassal. It will not be quite accurate to say that the cadre which has provided for the salaries of these officers would have taken into account the special duties on which these officers are now employed and for which special allowances are being given. Take, for instance, the cadre of the Deputy Collector. A Deputy Collector is intended to serve either as a Divisional Officer or a Treasury Deputy Collector. When he is taken out of that rut and put on other duties, which are not germane to the Deputy Collector's position, he has certainly a right to ask that for such special duties he must be given some special allowance. The salary of a cadre is invariably fixed according to the nature of its duties, its onerousness and its responsibility. The cadre of the Deputy Collector was fixed keeping in mind only the duties of the Deputy Collector, either as a Divisional Officer or as a Treasury Deputy Collector. It may be said that the salaries of these Deputy Collectors have recently been considerably improved. But I may at once inform the House that the present reorganization took place at a time when the Deputy Collectors had a right to expect besides their salary the special allowance now in question. For, when the cadre was reorganized these allowances formed part of the special appointments which they were asked to fill. The allowances in the mufassal are given only to those officers who are called upon to discharge duties entirely outside their usual legitimate duties. It cannot be denied that the four Deputy Collectors whose case we are now considering are Deputy Collectors who are doing a nature of duty which is wholly different from the ordinary duties of a Deputy Collector.

"I said already, Sir, that the House had discussed this question of allowances at some length in March last, and I said also that at that time the House naturally expected that Government would take the necessary action

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]

on it. I do not think I need tell the House what the Government have done. I will merely leave the hon. the Finance Member to speak on that matter. While presenting his Budget to the House on the 27th February last, the hon. the Finance Member distinctly told us :

‘ Let me take another case of even greater interest—our old friend, the allowances. As the Council are well aware, these were referred, as long ago as 1919, to the Salaries Committee who wrote 50 pages about them. The net result, as we saw last year, was imperceptible. Since then we have had many discussions and we have had a complete list of them compiled by the Accountant-General. The fact that it took his office no less than seven months to compile it will be an indication to the Council of the amount of detail involved. This fact alone was sufficient to prevent our coming to a satisfactory conclusion until our Retrenchment Secretary was appointed at the end of September last. He has spent the greater part of his time since then, both before, after and during the sittings of the Legislative Assembly, in tracing each of these thousands of allowances to its source, and in classifying and analysing them, and I am sure that the members of the Retrenchment Committee will bear testimony to the great success that has attended his efforts. I had hoped, if it had not been for his detention in Delhi, that Committee would have been able to complete their examination of the whole case in time for the budget. As it is, we are now sitting on the subject practically *de die in diem*, and I hope that we shall be able to make detailed recommendations to the Government in the course of the ensuing month.

And I may inform the House that a large number of recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee in that direction are being received by Government at the present moment, and that they are under consideration. And it is only after the Government have considered these proposals and have come to some conclusion that it will be time for the House to say what particular allowances or particular amounts of allowances which the Government still consider it desirable to continue, should be discontinued. Then, I say, will be the time for hon. Members of this House to interfere. At the present moment, if these allowances are cut down, it will only spread discontent in the case of officials concerned as the cuts in March last have already done in the minds of a small minority of them. I therefore beg the House to defer the consideration of this question until the Government have come to a final decision on the matter.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Sir, am I to understand that a special day or days will be allotted to the House to consider the question of allowances when the Retrenchment Committee’s work is over, or have we to table resolutions in the usual course on allowances and take our chance ? ”

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“ Mr. President, I am led to think that the hon. the Revenue Member is inclined to hold the view that the motion before the House is premature. But all the same I think that this is the legitimate and proper occasion for us to express our opinion in no uncertain terms so that it may go a great way in weighing with the Government in any decision which they may ultimately arrive at.

“ I rise to give my support to the motion before the House. It seems to me that the time has come when we should make up our minds to effect cuts in all these directions. We are faced with a huge and heavy deficit ; and, if I may so put it, we find ourselves in the swirls of a vicious current from which everybody should try to get out.

“ Turning to page 78 of the Budget, hon. Members of the House will find that the permanent strength of the Deputy Collector’s cadre is given as 155. Most of the Deputy Collectors who are not doing their normal work are not allowed this special pay. But the item with which we are now concerned relates to the grant of a special pay to four Deputy Collectors aggregating a sum of Rs. 4,800. On what special considerations these

12th March 1923] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

four Deputy Collectors are entitled to the special pay we are not told. On principle I rise to support this motion. It seems to me high time to scrutinize the principle of allowances and see if we cannot make up our minds to get rid of it. It is by no means to cause any detriment or prejudice to any officer who has been drawn from his legitimate sphere of work and who has been put in charge of a special duty that I plead for reduction. My submission, Sir, is this: there are a lot of persons doing such special duty and it is not that these people, or the four Deputy Collectors in question, will continue till the period of their retirement to be attached to the particular office. If a change is necessary, year after year their places may be taken by other persons and some of these gentlemen must be prepared to put up with a certain amount of inconvenience, and therefore there is absolutely no reason why we should not see our way to cut down, especially as it raises a question broad, and fundamental."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"I was informed not long ago that Government, in the case of some officers whose allowances were disallowed by this Council last year, had allowed them advance increments in the time-scale to make up for the loss. I think the Council will like to know why they were given such increments in spite of the fact that it cut down their allowances on the last occasion when the Budget was passed. I rise, Sir, to get this information from the Government."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"Sir, I beg to support this motion for the reason that the Council is more or less unanimous that this duty allowance should be abolished. Last year we managed to get rid of some of these allowances; but some others which were not exactly touched upon were continued; and those whose allowances were cut down, as the Raja of Ramnad says, were compensated by giving a grade promotion. Further, the duty allowance, hitherto called local allowance, and various other allowances are now designated as special pay. I do not know the object or the reason for designating these allowances as special pay. I do not think it is intended to deprive the voting power of the Council. Of course, this is a small item of concerning four officers; and I am not very particular about it. The rules the public service require that an officer once taken into it is bound to do the duty allotted to him, and no claim can be made by him for a special allowance for a special job. In the case of officers who are stationed in unhealthy places, it is different. But I should like to ask whether in this case it is necessary to grant them special pay. They are asked to do duty in connexion with the revision of adangals and this work is lighter in many respects than their ordinary work. I doubt whether they should get any extra allowance. As a matter of principle, I object to this grant of Rs. 4,800."

MR. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Sir, I also support the motion proposed by my hon. friend. If I understood the hon. the Revenue Member correctly, it seems to me that while Government accepted the cuts made last year, they are not prepared to accept the cuts proposed this year. I should like to know the point of view of the Government definitely as to whether, in their opinion, the provision of Rs. 4,800 ought necessarily to be there or whether they would wait for the Retrenchment Committee to cut it down. If it is the opinion of the Committee that the allowances which have been cut last year were unnecessary, it is all the more incumbent on the House to take upon itself the task of cutting down all these duty allowances."

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

[12th March 1923]

"I think, Sir, that the arguments advanced by the hon. the Revenue Member are not convincing. Last year in spite of the reasons advanced by the hon. the Revenue Member we cut down certain allowances, and this year too we are agreed that others should be cut down because no fresh arguments have been advanced for the continuance of these allowances. All these officers are for the purpose of preparing adangals, and that can be easily done by the Deputy Collectors. Deputy Collectors have been put on special duty as Co-operative Assistant Registrars, and the allowances of these too ought to be cut down. No doubt some of them have been cut down, and I see no reason at all why these officers should be given these allowances. If at all there is any necessity to wait for the Retrenchment Committee it will be for the purpose of seeing whether they will recommend these duty allowances. If the Committee say that these allowances should be attached to certain officers, then it will be open to this House to decide whether they will retain or abolish this allowance. In these circumstances, we find there is no necessity to continue these allowances till then."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"Sir, I rise to support this motion.

11-30 a.m.

Last year, this House unhesitatingly and emphatically declared that the so-called allowances which have now been termed 'special pay' should be left out of the Budget altogether. Last year, this House was not able to go through the whole Budget and cut down each and every allowance; but that is no reason why the Government should excuse themselves and retain some of the allowances which the House did not cut last year. Though the House was not able to enter in great detail into the Budget, yet they indicated the general principles on which the Government should proceed in framing the Budget. The House naturally expected that the Government would adopt the principles laid down by them. So far as the hon. the Revenue Member is concerned, he has just now told us that the Government is at present going through the report of the Retrenchment Committee. Is it suggested that this House has to wait till the Government have arrived at their conclusions in respect of the report of the Retrenchment Committee? I submit, Sir, that this Government, if it is responsible to this House, ought to act upon the principle laid down last year; else, there is no use of this House coming to a decision upon any matter. The principle on which this special pay is allowed to a certain number of Deputy Collectors is thoroughly wrong. When a Government servant engages to enter Government service, he must be prepared to do any work assigned to him by the Government. He must discharge all the duties entrusted to him only for the fixed salary which the post carries. The Government servant has no business to claim extra remuneration on the ground that he is doing some special work. Under these circumstances I submit, Sir, that the special pay of Rs. 4,800 ought to be omitted from the Budget."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Sir, I think it is right that I should explain to the House the position as regards the Retrenchment Committee in this matter of allowances. I may say, at the outset, that I fully recognize the justice of the complaints that have been made and the force of the statement of the last speaker that it is incumbent upon the Government to accept the vote of this House upon matters of this kind.

"What has happened is this. The Retrenchment Committee was specifically instructed by Government to submit its report on the subject of

12th March 1923]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

allowances within three months after its formation. The matter, however, has proved to be one of much greater complexity than at first sight appeared. The Committee first of all tried to lay down the general principles. Hon. Members of this House have remarked upon various questions of principle that affect these allowances and the Retrenchment Committee had naturally first to lay down general principles and then apply those principles to individual cases. This was a very lengthy business and they have latterly been sitting at it practically from day to day and they actually finished making their recommendations only on Saturday last. The present position of the matter is that most of the recommendations of the Committee have been sent piecemeal to the departments concerned for their consideration. It is only the consolidated report that is not yet ready for submission to the whole Cabinet. At the same time, a separate Committee is dealing with medical allowances, which are perhaps more numerous than those in other departments. Some decisions have already been taken on their report. What remains to be done is for the general report on the whole case to be written up and considered by the Government and the whole scheme co-ordinated, so that we shall not be charged with being unfair in cutting one department's allowances while we leave those of another standing. Probably that might be the case if individual members of the Government dealt with the recommendations sent to them without waiting for the examination of the whole case by the Cabinet. That is our present position. I have been strenuously trying to bring the whole thing to a conclusion before the discussion of the Budget. But owing to various reasons, we were not able to get the matter through the Retrenchment Committee until Saturday last. The Retrenchment Committee have now recommended certain scales. These may or may not be acceptable to the Government as a whole. The scales recommended by the Committee as well as those sanctioned by the Government have to be submitted for the approval of the House. The order of procedure that the Government desired to adopt in this matter was that the Committee should first arrive at some conclusions, that their proposals should then go to the Cabinet, and finally that the Government's orders should go to the House for their approval. Unfortunately we have been caught by the Budget, and we are not yet ready to deal with this question immediately. I am prepared to ask my hon. colleagues to discuss this matter if possible at an early date and come to a decision on the whole question and thus to meet the wishes of the House in all possible ways. As I have said, we have been caught unawares, though we have been struggling day after day to get through the whole matter. Unfortunately we were not able to finish our deliberations, and the result is we are now faced with these difficulties."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, for the reasons which I have already urged and for those urged by my hon. colleague, the Finance Member, I hope the House will see that it is very desirable that this question should be deferred until the full and detailed recommendations of the Retrenchment Committee and the decisions of the Government thereon are made available to the House. The House would then be in a position to decide for themselves whether the action which the Government propose to take would be justifiable or not."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Are we to understand that an opportunity will be given to discuss the Government's decision during this sitting?"

[12th March 1923]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"We are trying to meet before we close the Budget. In any case, every opportunity will be given to the House for coming to a conclusion on that question before we begin to utilize the allowances.

"Then, Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Arumainatha Pillai, with his usual vehemence told us that inasmuch as these Deputy Collectors entered the Government service with their eyes wide open, it was not at all justifiable that they should ask for special allowances over and above their fixed salaries. May I inform my hon. friend that they entered service with their eyes wide open and with the knowledge that, besides the fixed pay allowed to them under the cadre, they would be given special allowances also."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"That is a greater reason why special allowances should be cut off."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, I am hardly able to follow the logic of my hon. friend opposite.

"Again, Sir, I was greatly surprised to be told by another hon. friend that the work of the Deputy Collectors employed for the revision of adangals was much lighter than the work of Divisional Officers or the Treasury Deputy Collectors. That a statement of this kind should emanate from my hon. friend, Mr. Balaji Rao Nayudu, has taken me completely by surprise.

"Another hon. Member wanted to know what the Retrenchment Committee had done in regard to this matter. Inasmuch as the whole report of the Committee will be before this House in a very brief period, I think I am disclosing no secret when I say that they definitely recommend the restoration to the special settlement officers and their assistants the duty allowance of Rs. 100 which was taken away by this House last March. These Deputy Collectors on whose behalf I am now pleading also fall in the same category."

The motion was put and carried.

MOTION No. 2.

Mr. A. T. MUTTUKUMARASWAMI CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for measurers and hired labourers, instruments and chemicals and other contingencies by Rs. 3,000.

"I find that for 1922-23 the revised estimate only allowed Rs. 3,000 for this purpose. I cannot understand why double that amount should be budgeted for the ensuing year. No special reasons are mentioned for this increase, and in the absence of such reasons, I am sure the House will only be discharging its legitimate duty if it asks the Government to limit their expenditure to the amount allotted last year, that is, Rs. 3,000."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, this is a very small item which has attracted the attention of my hon. friend. The only reason that I can urge is that it is more or less a varying item from year to year. It depends upon the bulk of the work that has to be done. At the present moment, the revision of adangals and the special revision survey work are in full operation in the Bellary and Anantapur districts. In the Kistna district, the revision of adangals prior to resurvey is in operation too. In the Bellary and Anantapur

12th March 1923] [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

districts, some special staff is necessary for subdivision work, for further demarcation of *poramboke* and hence only as much provision as is just enough for that work has been entered in the Budget. The amount noted in the Budget represents the cost of measurers, hired labourers, boundary pillars and so on. If the amount is reduced, the outturn of work will proportionately be reduced. Instead of doing this small piece of work in the course of one year, it will become necessary to spread it over several years. The expenditure cannot at all be saved, but it will have to be incurred though not in this year at least in the succeeding years."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, if the item is so small, there is absolutely no reason why there should be any opposition for the reduction of this amount. Turning to page 33 of the Budget, the House will observe that for 1921-22, no amount was allotted under this head. In 1922-23, we find a provision of Rs. 3,000 for the first time in the revised estimate. For the ensuing year, this amount has been doubled, with the result that instead of Rs. 3,000, we are now asked to vote for Rs. 6,000. We only ask the Government to limit their expenditure to the amount put down in the revised estimate for the current year. I hope the House will accept this motion especially in view of the good auspices under which we have begun our work to-day."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 3.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to move—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,50,000 for temporary establishment.

"Sir, in the first place, I do not understand the purpose for which this temporary establishment is needed. I am told by some of my non-official friends that it might be intended for the revision of the land cess. If that be so, I do not think that it requires such an elaborate staff costing as much as three lakhs and over. As far as my present knowledge of taluk offices goes, I do not think that a taluk office requires a temporary staff at such a heavy cost to the tax-payer. I therefore propose the omission of this allotment."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB

11-45 a.m. Bahadur :—"Sir, the hon. Member naturally wishes to know

why it is that the temporary establishment is needed, and I am glad to furnish that information to him. The temporary establishment is intended for the purpose of revision of adangals in the districts of Gōdāvari, Kistna, Bellary, Anantapur, Trichinopoly, South Kanara and Malabar. The strength of the temporary establishment that has to be entertained in a particular area depends upon the quantity of work that the department has got to do. There is nothing like a fixed rule in regard to the nature and the bulk of temporary establishments to be taken as in the case of permanent establishments. In the case of permanent establishments, this process is easy as we are of course bound to provide only for the permanent cadre. It is for the purpose of effecting a real economy that in the Survey and in the Settlement departments we have always carried on the work largely through the medium of temporary establishments. If we had asked the House permission to take on as much permanent establishment as would be necessary for the conduct of our work from year to year, I am

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]

afraid that the expenditure would have been far greater than that which Government are incurring under the present system of a part of the establishment only being permanent and the rest being recruited from time to time on a temporary basis. Here, again, Sir, my hon. friend on the other side is somewhat vexed with the taluk establishments, and he tells us that they need no sort of help at all and that it is up to them to do this additional work as well. But I am afraid, Sir, that the experience of Settlement Officers is just the contrary. Mr. Moir, who was with us during the last budget debate and who was recognized as the most popular Settlement Officer that this Presidency has known, while speaking on a similar motion last time, distinctly told us that it represented additional work that had to be done, but for which Government steadily refused to make the establishment permanent on the ground of cheapness. It is thus a measure of cheapness and not one of extravagance, and the work they do is essentially in the nature of administrative work of the department. Mr. Moir stated :

Then, I think, I can speak with some authority as regards the amount of work that is cast on the revenue establishment during resettlements. It is a work that cannot be done by the ordinary establishment. I know personally the amount of work devolving on settlement parties in bringing the village accounts up to date and also the amount of work it casts in its turn on the taluk establishment. For this, as I have said, the ordinary establishment is not enough. If these operations are postponed, we shall simply be piling up heavy arrears and postponing to a future date heavy unavoidable schemes for expenditure on measures such as re-surveys and revision of adangals and in order to make that good later on we shall be put to the necessity of incurring expenditure on a much larger scale than the proposals which have been put forward now by the Revenue Department.

“These are, Sir, the personal experiences of an officer who held the position of Special Settlement Officer for years, and speaking as he does from personal experience, I would appeal to the House to consider whether it will be desirable to cut down these temporary establishments thereby piling up work which at some stage or other will have to be done. We have to consider, Sir, not only the necessity of our own administrative machinery, but also the rights and privileges of the ryot at large. He insists on some information or other being furnished to him at every resettlement, and we are bound to give it to him. For instance, he must know where his land exactly is, what the actual extent of his land is, whether any body has encroached on it, and so on. All these particulars have to be gathered and furnished. If we refuse to do so, I do not know how we will be justified in going to him and collecting the revenue. These are all responsibilities which the Government have to undertake, and we are now asked to abandon them and leave the whole work to take care of itself.”

MR. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—“If Malabar is excepted, I would like to know what is being done as regards the settlement registers in other places. What system of adangals do they have?”

RAO BAHADUR T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—“Mr. President, I suppose under the Standing Orders of the Board of Revenue it is the duty of village officers and the taluk officers to see that the adangals are always properly kept by noting the changes that occur from time to time, and I do not quite understand why a special establishment should be introduced between the survey and settlement establishments for doing the work which is neglected by the ordinary establishment. Fifteen or twenty years ago, when the settlement operations were going on, I think I was in charge of a taluk as Tahsildar; and I do not think there was then any such preliminary work being done by an establishment going through the revision of adangals. Of

12th March 1923]

[Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu]

course latterly, owing to the increase of work all round, there might have been necessity for it as expressed by the best of our Settlement Officers, Mr. Moir. If we have got funds, there may be necessity for many other things also. But my point is that the same work was done some years ago by the regular establishment. Now, the revenue officers have got increased salaries; their duties have been reduced all round in a variety of ways and they have got to do much less work now than the old revenue officers; and with all that, they want additional hands to do the work for them. Moreover, Sir, last year, and the year before that, we were agitating for the suspension of all survey and resettlement operations. But, instead of that, let there be no temporary establishment hereafter now that we are faced with a deficit in our budget. That is the only point I would urge for the consideration of the House. My point is I expect the work to be done by the regular staff who are getting more salaries than before."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I say one word, Sir, with reference to what the hon. Member just now said? Like him I remember times many years ago when it was the practice to keep revenue accounts without having a special staff to bring them up to date. I am bound to say that, when I was in charge of the Revenue portfolio, I did not quite understand the necessity for these establishments, because when I was a karnam I used to keep the stones in order and to keep the books without difficulty. But I found that I had not reckoned with the influence of the fragmentation of holdings. The fragmentation of holdings is growing to such an extent that it is almost impossible to get these accounts kept by the ordinary karnams. As the House knows, if a man has seven fields and seven sons, when he dies, the land does not go at the rate of one field to one son, but one-seventh of each field goes to each son. That process is going on and the work is becoming greater and greater and the establishment has to cope also with a great many subdivisions which are not demarcated. So, when I was in charge of the Revenue portfolio, I went to see what these men were doing and found that there was a perfectly hopeless conglomeration of work that was being worked off by the settlement parties. Whether we are going to refuse to recognize further fragmentation of holdings, or to abolish karnams and replace them by revenue inspectors at the rate of one to half a dozen villages are questions which may perhaps be considered. But on the present basis we must have this staff if we are to get on with the resettlement work at all.

"Finally, I would ask the House to remember that the word 'temporary' here simply means 'non-pensionable'. We have different sorts of temporary staffs. We may have a man to do a particular work for a short time, or we may have men, as we have in the Survey and Settlement Department and in the Public Works Department, men who really work continuously throughout a fairly long service, but do not get a pension. The only point in regard to these temporary men is that they are very cheap. We can get rid of them at any time and there is no pensionary liability. I would ask the Council to look at the matter from this point of view, that what we really have is a non-pensionable establishment for this work."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, only one matter, I think, I should mention for the information of the hon. mover of this motion. I would invite his attention to

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]

the Committee on Survey and Resettlement which sat here the other day and of which my hon. friend was also a member. In the discussion of this very question, no tangible suggestions were made in that Committee as to how the revision of adangals could be substituted by any other machinery. For, I believe the Committee felt that the revision of adangals was an inevitable precedent to the conduct of the resurvey. But I would also invite his attention to the fact that at that time I made a definite promise to the Committee that in future whenever the resettlement of any district was taken up after the adangals had been revised previously by means of separate establishments, I would investigate the necessity for the establishment of a separate staff to re-do the work. I have accordingly issued instructions to say that in future whenever applications are made for a special staff for doing adangal work, the officer concerned will have to satisfy me that there is absolute necessity for it."

Rao Bahadur P. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"After hearing the hon. the Finance Member and the hon. the Revenue Member, I do not wish to press my motion. I withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 4.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to move the following:—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,50,000 for temporary establishment by Rs. 50,000.

"Only one or two points I have to say. The hon. the Revenue Member said that this item is intended to cover the adangal revision charges of six various districts. I thought that the department under the hon. the Finance Member was very accurate. Looking at page 29, paragraph 9, of the hon. the Finance Member's memorandum, it is stated that it represents provision for the revision of adangals in Bellary, Anantapur and Kistna. Only these three districts have been mentioned in that memorandum.

"Another big question that has been raised is as to whether the temporary establishment is cheaper than the permanent establishment. So far as I can see, Sir, the temporary establishment is cheaper from the Government point of view, because they have not to give pensions to these people; and so far as the autocratic officials are concerned, it may be better for them to have temporary establishments, because if a man says anything against anybody, they can easily dispense with his services and he will have to go even without a right of appeal. So, from the point of view of the Government, this establishment is very good; but we have to consider the question from the point of view of the ordinary ryot as well. We know how difficult it is for a ryot to attend upon and please the temporary officers of the Survey and Resettlement departments at the time of every fresh settlement and his position will become more difficult if he has to please a third department, viz., the temporary adangal revision department. And a man who is temporary, who has absolutely no stake in the establishment and who knows that any autocratic officer may at any time dispense with his services, may reap a good harvest when the wind is blowing. So from the point of view of the ryot, it is better for him to deal with the permanent establishment rather than with the temporary. It is

12th March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

not at all desirable, Sir, that year after year the temporary establishment should go from district to district, having no status whatever and having no sort of stake in the permanent establishment, and be allowed to do the work. So, the sooner we make all our establishments permanent the better.

"Then I was surprised to learn that the temporary establishments were doing better work than the permanent establishments. The permanent establishments have always got a stake on their work. They have got their future pensions to look up to and they will be expected to do better work than a man who comes to-day and goes away to-morrow. Therefore, the cheapness I do not think is worth mentioning. As to better work, it is also not worth mentioning. All that I want, so far as I am concerned, is not to send away the whole temporary establishment at once, but only to make reasonable reductions.

"According to the revised estimate for 1922-23, the cost is only Rs. 3,35,000. It is difficult to see why there is an increase of Rs. 15,000 provided for in the Budget for 1923-24 especially when we have a deficit of 40 lakhs. It may be that we will have an announcement made to the effect that this deficit will be reduced on account of some windfalls. In any case, with any deficit whatever, it is desirable to reduce such provisions as much as possible, without doing any harm to the permanent establishment. We should therefore cut down the allotment for the temporary establishment by this small sum of Rs. 50,000."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, I have nothing more to urge in justification of this allotment than what I have already said. However, I am indeed thankful to the hon. the mover for having, with a large heart, permitted me to convert as many of these temporary men into permanent hands as I possibly can. I shall, when I present my next Budget, have very great pleasure in bringing such a proposal. I do feel that these temporary men are not being treated properly. I think they ought to be confirmed; but my only fear was that I could not possibly get the support of this House. Now that I have the support of the hon. mover, I shall take courage and act accordingly.

"Then, Sir, there was some sort of confusion somewhere as to why Rs. 3,35,000 which is found in the revised estimate for the current year should have been raised to 3,50,000. As I have repeatedly pointed out, the bulk of the work to be done in each year, either under the Survey or the Settlement operations, depends upon the number of districts to be taken up, the area to be taken up and so on. We calculate the quantity of work that has got to be done in a given year and then convert it into an allotment that is necessary for that purpose. These operations are all conducted on more or less task work principles. Each man is expected to turn out a fixed quantity of work in the course of a day or in the course of a month according to the nature of the duties he is engaged upon. While calculating the actual amount that would be required for the year 1923-24, we found that we would require no less than Rs. 3,93,000, but in view of the retrenchment which we are equally anxious to procure, we have budgeted for Rs. 40,000 less, on the off-chance that if the additional sum of Rs. 40,000 is required in the next year, we hoped to reappropriate it from some other head if money was available. It is not that we have provided for more than what we require, but as a matter of fact we have provided for less."

The motion was put and lost.

[12th March 1923]

MOTION No. 5.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"Sir, I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,50,000 for temporary establishment by Rs. 15,000.

Sir, the hon. the Revenue Member has already anticipated this motion and has given an answer as to why there is an increase of Rs. 15,000 for the temporary establishment. But what I say is this: in spite of what the hon. the Revenue Member has said, I would ask him whether he could not consent to go on with this Rs. 3,35,000 now, and then see how far this work has been carried out. In this Council we are accustomed to hear of what are called supplementary grants. If, then, he feels that he is not able to get on with this Rs. 3,35,000, he may come forward with a supplementary grant. Sir, in these days of financial stringency which has been so much complained of by the hon. the Revenue Member himself, I would ask him to go on with the same establishment and with the same salary as last year."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am afraid I cannot accept that. I wish to inform the House that I have already made a reduction of Rs. 40,000 and I wish the House to avoid the trouble of my having to appear before it constantly and ask for small petty supplementary grants."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I wish to support this motion. If what the hon. the Finance Member said is correct, viz., that it is an establishment which is going on from year to year, though without pension, I fail to see why there is no provision at all in the actual accounts of 1921-22 under this head. Again, if the hon. the Revenue Member is intending to ask for Rs. 40,000, he may as well ask for Rs. 55,000. I therefore think that this Rs. 15,000 at least ought to be cut down."

The motion was put and lost.

MOTION No. 6.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 5,000.

Though this is only a small matter, yet I would like to move it. In the revised estimate for 1922-23 a provision has been made for Rs. 32,800. It is true that in the Budget for 1923-24 the provision has been cut down by Rs. 2,800. Now my submission is that it can be further cut down by Rs. 5,000, i.e., to the extent of about 15 per cent. I hope that it is still possible for the Government to take note of the discussion of this Council in respect of this sum and issue necessary instructions to the departmental officers to minimize travelling to such an extent as to make it possible for the Government not to exceed this amount; in other words, to see that the travelling allowance does not exceed Rs. 25,000. It is a matter for departmental officers to take note of and I do not think that unless one is prepared to carry on touring on a very extensive scale, it will be necessary for the Government to exceed this provision."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I may assure the House that the amount I have entered here represents another item of self-sacrifice. The actual amount necessary under

12th March 1923] [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

the present travelling allowance rules which allow a reduced rate to these officers was Rs. 50,000; but keeping in mind the fact that I may probably be acting discreetly if by a smaller provision I could ask my officers to reduce their travelling, though it is to the prejudice of work which I cannot help, I have asked for Rs. 30,000 only. I may tell the House that considering the number of districts which this establishment has to tour round and considering also the fact that they have to be in camp without any limitation, sometimes for months together continuously, it will be impossible to do the work for a less amount than is entered in the Budget."

The motion was put and lost.

MOTION No. 7.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—"Sir, the motion that stands in my name runs thus :

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 19,067 for Director of Survey by Rs. 2,400.

Sir, the principle contained in my motion has already been accepted on the very first motion. This sum of Rs. 2,400 is made up of the personal allowance of Rs. 200 per mensem to the Director of Survey. I do not think I need detain the Council for a long time, because it has already accepted the principle."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, this is an allowance that has been sanctioned to the Director of Survey under the orders of the Government of India and the Secretary of State. It has already come under the searchlight of the examination of our Retrenchment Committee and we have certain definite recommendations from them on this matter and that recommendation—I think I am not divulging any secret of that committee—is to the effect that we shall have to continue this allowance for very good reasons. The whole cadre of the Survey department is now provincial. Formerly it was Imperial. The minimum pay of the Director of Survey and the maximum pay of the Deputy Director, or Assistant Director left very little margin between the two so as to induce any decent officer holding the latter position to accept the former position inasmuch as it gave no immediate increase to him at all. The question was considered when the department was reorganized on a provincial basis. Formerly, as I said, it was Imperial. In trying to re-organize it, we reduced the scale of all the establishments so as to conform as far as possible to the provincial scales; but then we had to keep in mind the scales of these European officers in the service, who were recruited under the old conditions and to whom the application of the present provincial scale would have been, if I may say so, a violation of the moral obligation which Government owed to them. I have heard it repeatedly urged in this House that the only way of providing for the recruitment of the Europeans is to create a special pay for them but fix the pay of the whole cadre on provincial basis. We have kept that principle of the House in mind. In this particular case we have reduced the scale to provincial one and when we had to deal with a few European officers, we put them in that particular grade to which they are entitled under the scale and compensate them by reason of the fact that they were recruited under the old conditions, and that the scale of pay when

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]

they entered the service was far higher than the present scale of pay while they had every reason to expect that the old conditions would continue until the day of their retirement. We wanted to meet that difficulty by allowing personal allowances to these officers. Thus, Sir, it is in keeping with this principle that we have reduced the scale of the provincial services and decided to meet hard cases by the grant of overseas allowances in some and by the grant of special allowances in others so as to compensate them for the loss of pay and prospects which result on account of the reorganization."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"I am glad that the hon. the Revenue Member himself said that this service was originally a European service and that this has to be slowly but completely indianized. Sir, what we are now asking is that so far as this service is concerned, whether Imperial or Provincial, all the allowances should be cut down. So far as the Imperial services are concerned, this House cannot do anything. Therefore, it is the greater reason why this House should express its decision on an Imperial service which has now become a Provincial service and say that this service shall not be entitled to any allowance. This will give an opportunity to the country to agitate and come forward and say that for all services, whether Imperial or Provincial, such allowances should not be given, that there shall be only one cadre and that there ought not to be any difference of pay.

"I was not quite aware of this particular circumstance and I am extremely glad that the hon. the Revenue Member has stated it. Another thing that he stated was that this was a provincial item and that it should remain in the Budget pending the report of the Retrenchment Committee. I would respectfully ask the House, Sir, whether they are going to allow the Government to give direction to the Retrenchment Committee. If hon. Members of this House were to allow this procedure to be adopted which means a direction to the Retrenchment Committee that all appointments carrying a salary of above Rs. 200 should be treated in a different manner than those with a lesser salary, I would ask the hon. the Revenue Member and this House to think about such a course and say whether they are prepared, having accepted the principle that there should be no personal allowances to any service men, to make an exception in this case and give the officer concerned an allowance of Rs. 200."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"I should just like to say one or two words about the question of the principle governing personal allowances which was referred to by the previous speaker. I do not know of any principle that attaches to these allowances except that they are given to special persons for particular reasons. A personal allowance is not given because a particular establishment does particular work, nor is it given to any individual who holds a particular post. It is given to a particular individual generally to compensate him for loss of emoluments. Here in this case you want to provincialise a service. But you have got certain men in the service who were recruited on other terms than those you want to give them now. When you want to provincialise a service, you lay down a scale which is suitable for provincial service. But there are a few others whom you ought to continue to pay in accordance with the conditions under which they were recruited, and see that they finish their service on the terms on which they were engaged. To say that on principle personal allowances should be abolished in all services, whether the men were recruited as provincial or

12th March 1923]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

imperial servants, would mean that the Government should inflict injustice on certain classes of its servants in order to provincialise them. I appeal to the Council to say that this personal allowance is an allowance due to a particular individual for the rest of the time he continues in service. It is only fair that when you reduce the general scale of pay, you must let men recruited under the old conditions finish their service on the terms on which they were engaged."

The motion was put to the vote and lost.

MOTION No. 8.

Mr. A. T. MUTTUKUMARASWAMI CHETTIYAR :—" The motion that stands in my name runs as follows :—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for special pay to Assistant Directors.

I have already urged that all special pay should be done away with. In the case of Assistant Directors of Survey who get high salaries such allowances are unnecessary. I therefore move that the allotment for special pay for Assistant Directors be omitted."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" This refers to a sum of Rs. 100 provided for the Assistant Director of Survey who is in charge of the Central Survey Office. This is an allowance which has been sanctioned to that officer by reason of the fact that if he held charge of a party he would be entitled to a monthly charge allowance of Rs. 100. It is only officers of high status in the department and high pay in the scale that will be put in charge of the Central Survey Office. Such officers if they are not employed in the Central Survey Office, would ordinarily be employed in charge of parties and they would be entitled to an allowance of Rs. 100, *ipso facto*. Because they have been compelled to be away from their parties, not at their own request but in the interests of public work, they ought not to suffer. It has been repeatedly held by the Government of India that the charge of the Central Survey Office should be regarded as analogous to, if not more responsible than, the charge of a party in the mufassal. These are the reasons which justify the continuance of the allowance."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" This is a case exactly similar to the one which we have already disallowed. I think if the hon. the Finance Member wishes to make a reduction he can do so. Therefore I support the motion before the House."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" In the absence of a recommendation from the Retrenchment Committee that these officers should be paid a special pay, and in the absence of any information on the necessity for this special pay, I think this motion should be passed."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—" This is an allowance which really comes under the classification of presidency allowance. What the Retrenchment Committee are inclined to think is that every officer at the headquarters of the Government should be placed on one regular scale and that committee will deal with this along with other officers like the Presidency Magistrates and so on, and also every member of the provincial service who is taken to the headquarters of the Government. Regarding this particular individual, he is simply an officer at the head-quarters."

The motion was put to vote and carried.

[12th March 1923]

MOTION No. 9.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows:—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 42,142 for pay of officers by Rs. 2,742.

After it was announced in this Council that you, Sir, were good enough to reduce your salary by one-third and that the hon. the Ministers were good enough to reduce their salaries also I think that it would be necessary under the stringent conditions of finances through which this presidency is passing, to make a reduction in a certain proportion under this item. The principle upon which I shall proceed with my motion, and the various amendments down below is this: that every officer who is drawing a pay more than Rs. 300 should be satisfied with the increase that he will get owing to the time-scale that has recently been introduced. It is upon that principle that I have arrived at the figure of Rs. 2,742. As per the revised estimate we spent for 1922-23 Rs. 39,400, and this year the duty allowance is Rs. 2,742 making a total of Rs. 42,142. I leave it to the House to judge for themselves if the Government are justified in going on increasing their expenditure".

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am sorry the hon. the mover of this motion has misunderstood this item. The fact is that Rs. 2,742 really represents the pay and not the increment on the pay of the officers under that head. Correctly speaking, the bulk of it represents the pay of the Photo Expert, whom we have recently brought from England on a five years' engagement; and he has to be paid on the terms on which he was engaged. Before I engaged him I obtained the assent of this House and they were good enough to sanction the amount that was asked for, and he is now doing his work. Therefore, the difference between the current year's figure and the next year's is thus explicable".

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 10.

Mr. A. T. MUTTUKUMARASWAMI CHETTIYAR:—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows:—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,00,000 for temporary establishment by Rs. 25,000.

The temporary establishments in question are more or less permanent, being renewed every year. I do not know when we shall be without them. Let us make a beginning by cutting down the charges by one-fourth this time."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"This does not require much explanation from me. I have already tried to impress upon this House that the system upon which we have been working is with a view to secure economy. I have been told that our policy in future should be to have more permanent establishments, and few temporary ones. I may tell the House at once that we have got at the present moment five permanent survey parties, besides three temporary parties. But the strength of the Upper Subordinates is sufficient only for three parties while that of the ministerial staff is sufficient for no more than two parties. With a permanent establishment which cannot suffice for more than two

12th March 1923] [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

or three parties, as the case may be, eight parties have to be at work throughout the presidency, and I ask the House whether it is possible to carry on the work without temporary establishments. We have found as a matter of calculation that during the first eight months of the year we have been at work, we have already spent Rs. 1,22,000 on the temporary establishment, and we were aware we would require a much larger sum next year. Sir, it seems to me that since the 'Inchcape rock' came into operation we have reduced even our minimum demand to the irreducible minimum of one lakh next year. If this also is reduced, I can tell the House that I have merely to leave the officers to mark their time and they will never be able to carry on their work efficiently. Instead of completing one district within the allotted time they will have to prolong indefinitely. Will this be after all real economy?"

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I have given notice of a similar motion, and if I rise to speak on it now, I do so, not to support the motion, but to ask my hon. friend the mover of the motion to withdraw it, in view of the speech so enthusiastically and effectively delivered just now by the hon. the Revenue Member."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 11.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"The motion that stands in my name runs as follows:—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,440 for local allowance.

I find an item of Rs. 1,440 under the head of local allowance on page 34 of the Budget. I think it would be well if the hon. the Revenue Member explains what that item is for."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"This is a compensatory local allowance of Rs. 120 attached to the office of the Director of Surveys under old orders and which has been continued, so to say, from officer to officer. It was sanctioned at a time when the pay of the Director underwent a revision for the worse on the recommendation of the Committee which sat some years ago. In view of the position and responsibility of the work of this office, the Government of India and the Secretary of State held that inasmuch as his present position has in no way improved by reason of the re-organization which has been recently sanctioned, a sum of Rs. 120 as compensatory allowance which was granted to the previous Directors of Survey must likewise continue to be paid to the present Director.

12-30 p.m. • "The pay now is Rs. 1,200 to Rs. 1,600. It has undergone a material change and so this compensatory allowance was considered absolutely essential. The House will see that the minimum pay of the Director is Rs. 1,200 only, whereas, the maximum pay of an Assistant Director—in the selection grade—is Rs. 1,100. The difference between the maximum of the Assistant Director and minimum of the Director is only Rs. 100, and it will not be worth while for an Assistant Director from the mufassal to come to the metropolis to shoulder more serious responsibility than was involved when he was in charge of the party, without any monetary gain. Therefore it is that this allowance has been fixed. This again comes

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]

under the category of the presidency allowance, about which the Retrenchment Committee has made certain proposals and which the Government will consider."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"The Revenue Member is drawing out a difference between the Provincial service and the Imperial service. Last year, it was Imperial, and this year it is Provincial ; but on the same pay. Again, there are the Personal and Local allowances. We were made to understand that the transfer of the cadre from the Imperial to the Provincial would lead to cheapness. I do not know how. We were told by the Finance Member that the allowance of Rs. 200 was a presidency allowance."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I told the House that this was a personal allowance and that it was quite different from the presidency allowance."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"Very well. I thought that this allowance was given because the officer was in the Presidency town. From what the Revenue Member said I understand that no Assistant Director would care to come to the metropolis for hundred rupees more."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"A personal allowance is an allowance which is attached to a particular officer. The presidency allowance is an allowance given for living in the presidency town."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"We do not know when this particular person will retire. We do not know whether he will retire soon or not. It may be that there is time enough for his retirement. We are giving him Rs. 200 as Presidency allowance. Besides this he is getting two or three other allowances. When we are against one allowance for one person, this person seems to get many allowances."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"May I try to make this clear? I think we are all agreed that we should give Presidency allowance to people who work in the headquarters on account of the higher cost of living. This allowance is now under discussion and whatever rate is decided upon will be substituted for the present rate. A personal allowance is quite a different matter. It depends upon the pay of the officer and the rate at which he is recruited for the rest of the service. As soon as he goes away, he will be replaced by an officer who does not get a personal allowance."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"Personal allowance depends upon the individual officers. Even last year the Council, by a majority, voted against personal allowance and local allowance in some cases. This is one of that kind. This officer seems to get even a house-rent allowance of Rs. 100."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"No, he does not, Sir."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"However, I am against any local allowance except in the case of the Agency and other unhealthy localities."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Probably I did not make myself sufficiently clear. I thought I had made it somewhat clear that the scale of the Superintendent had

12th March 1923] [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

undergone change from time to time. I particularly referred to the year 1891 and said that the scale of pay of the Director—Superintendent as he then was—was Rs. 1,500 rising to Rs. 1,800. The next stage in the evolution of this department was a change for the worse in the case of the pay of the Director. In 1905, it was reduced to Rs. 1,200 to Rs. 1,400. It was then felt that it was rather an injustice to the Director of Survey who joined the service on the assurance of a salary of Rs. 1,500—1,800 that he should be deprived of the future prospect which he had every right to count. Then, in 1905, this compensatory allowance of Rs. 120 was added as part of the pay."

The motion was put and lost.

MOTION No. 12.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" Sir, I beg to move—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,400 for two Assistant Directors, temporary, for one year.

It will be seen at page 35 that last year there were ten Assistant Directors for whom a pay of Rs. 55,200 was provided. This year, provision is made for nine Assistant Directors and the amount is more than last year, namely, Rs. 60,990. In addition to this, two Assistant Directors are sought to be employed temporarily for one year at a cost of Rs. 8,400. I fail to see, Sir, why these temporary gentlemen should be employed for this year."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Probably it is not known, Sir, that the survey parties are not always employed on one definite set of work. The Survey Department not only conducts what is called the Government survey, but it also conducts what is called survey in the proprietary areas. The number of survey parties, of course, is fixed so far as permanency is concerned; and that is why over and above what the Secretary of State has sanctioned years ago we always have one temporary party at our disposal. If a larger number of proprietors want surveys of their estates, we then determine whether the six survey parties will suffice for both work, and if we find it is insufficient we again take additional temporary parties. Next year, we are going to have eight parties. We find that the bulk of survey work is much larger than this year. We propose to have seven parties for Government work and one for estate work. These two temporary survey officers were doing estate work in the current year and there was a contribution received on their behalf in the current year's budget. Next year, we solely employ them on Government work. This is only a transposition and not a real addition."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I am afraid, Sir, I am not at all convinced by the reasons given by the hon. the Revenue Member. I fail to see why when there is no provision for any temporary establishment in the current year these two persons should be employed for the coming year. Again, the hon. Member said that the work is increasing and therefore provision should be made. He also mentioned in this connexion the work that has to be done in the estates. I say, Sir, that we are not concerned with the estates now. We are only concerned with the Government parties and so far as the Government work is concerned, I fail to see why there should be increase of work to the Government parties which, after all, only work hard against the ryots. Survey means settlement and settlement

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

[12th March 1923]

means more revenue. Therefore, the less employment we find for these parties, the greater will be the comfort to the ryots. Therefore, Sir, I press this motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I fear, Sir, in this case, again, I have not been understood. I think, Sir, I said in sufficiently plain language that we were engaging only five parties on Government survey work during the current year, and that we were employing two temporary parties on estate work. Our liabilities for the next year have increased. We have to employ a larger number of survey parties on Government work. We intend therefore to utilize seven survey parties for doing Government work. We shall be able to spare only one survey party for doing estate work. The parties which should do estate work are now called upon to do Government work in the next year; and hence the provision for them, instead of being made on the other page of the Budget, has had to be made under Government survey."

The motion was put and lost.

MOTION No. 13.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"I beg to move—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,500 for two Assistant Directors, temporary for five months.

Honourable Members of this House would see that the establishment constituted for 1923-24 was not in existence in the year 1922-23. This motion is entirely different from the one moved by Mr. Narasimhacharlu which has been almost unanimously negatived. But by means of this motion I do not in any way seek to interfere with the two probationers for whom provision has been made in this Budget. This refers to two Assistant Directors as a temporary provision for five months for which an allotment of Rs. 3,500 has been made. So far as this item is concerned, it shows a tendency to increase the number and until I hear from the hon. Member to the contrary I am led to think that there is no justification for the establishment or the continuance of the two Assistant Directors. And my attitude with reference to this motion will depend very largely upon the statement to be made by the hon. the Revenue Member."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB

12-45 p.m.

Bahadur:—"Sir, I confess that it is not probably quite easy to understand why this establishment has been asked for for a period of five months and I am delighted to explain why it is asked for only for five months. We have now got a temporary party working in the Trichinopoly district. This is one of the two temporary parties. We hoped that the work of this party now working in the Trichinopoly district would be completed on the 31st March 1923, and we then intended to amalgamate it with the other party working in Malabar. But we now find that the quantity of work to be done in the Trichinopoly district would still require the retention of that party for another five months. We cannot, therefore, send away that party to Malabar. In Malabar we cannot go on with the work unless there are officers to man the party. We, therefore, take on temporarily for five months two officers to man the party in Malabar and when the party in Trichinopoly is relieved after five months, after the completion of the work there, the officers now manning the party in Trichinopoly

12th March 1923] [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

will automatically be transferred to Malabar and the necessity for these two temporary officers would then cease."

• Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"I have no desire, Sir, to dislocate the work that is being done. In view of the statement made by the hon. Member for Revenue, I beg leave to withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 14.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"Sir, I beg to move—

*To omit the allotment of Rs. 7,700 for charge allowance to seven temporary
• • Assistant Directors.*

We have already discussed the question of charge allowances to-day and for the same reasons which I then put forward, I submit that the charge allowance for these seven temporary Assistant Directors may be omitted."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, whatever the House may do with regard to this charge allowance for the officers who have been put in charge of parties, I must point out that I regard this charge allowance as highly essential. There are two gazetted officers employed in each survey party. One of them is invariably a senior—one in whom both the Director and the Government have confidence—and he is given the charge of the whole party; and the other gazetted officer works under him as his assistant. The officer who is in charge of the party and who has got, therefore, the responsibility of carrying on the work of the whole party—it may be only in one district or it may be in more districts than one—has certainly got far greater responsibility to shoulder than the other gazetted officer who is a subordinate to him. He is, so to say, a commanding officer with all risks and responsibilities attendant to this position. If, Sir, we are told that though he has higher responsibilities, higher risks to face and larger work to do, he must be content with the same pay as his assistant gets, it will be unfair to the senior officer. I, therefore, request, Sir, that just as the House was good enough to continue this allowance during the last budget discussion, it will be good enough to exercise the same generosity towards these people and continue the allowance for the next year also."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"I take it, Sir, that what was allowed last time was with regard to the Imperial Service officer and this allowance now refers, I think, to the Indian Provincial Service officers most of whom are temporary and graded at 350—25—900. Rupees 350 is, I think, a good initial salary and I, therefore, do not see the necessity of paying them a hundred rupees more."

The motion was put and carried.

MOTION No. 15.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAK :—"Sir, I beg to move—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for two probationers.

We find from the budget estimate that in the current year there are 11 officers, but for the year 1923-24, 16 officers have been provided for, including the two probationers. Of course, I know that two of these are only for five months. But even then, it seems to me that, in the place of 11 officers, there is no need for appointing as many as 16 officers. Of course,

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[12th March 1923]

I do remember what my hon. friend Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib said with reference to the previous items, that the Government intends to have more survey work done in the coming year than in the current year. Nevertheless, there must be some proportion between the expenditure incurred on survey this year and the expenditure to be incurred next year; so that, it seems to me that the Government may very well be satisfied with 14 officers for next year in the place of the 11 officers. For these reasons, I make this motion."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"I have also given notice of a similar motion and I support this motion, Sir."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Probably the House will be glad to know why I have made this provision and, after knowing it, I am sure the House will pass the provision with acclamation. I have already told the House that the service of the Survey Department has been provincialised. We do not in future recruit them from England. We intend to recruit them wholesale in India and inasmuch as we have got in other departments in the provincial service something like direct recruitment in the gazetted rank we want to have in this department also a direct recruitment to the gazetted rank. These two probationers will be local men, men with sufficient University education and with sufficient family status and position, who will not care to enter the Survey Department as either surveyors or deputy surveyors but who will certainly have no objection if they are asked to enter this department in the gazetted rank as assistant directors. We had two assistant directors in the year before last. Their period was only for two years and it will be over by the end of this year. For the next year I want to take on two more and those two will necessarily be Indians and if the House does not want any direct recruitment of Indians to the Survey Department, I leave it to vote as it likes."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I am glad, Sir, that my hon. friend has made the statement that the probationers to be recruited will be provincial men. But at the same time, though I am for provincial recruitment, I am not for unnecessary expenditure. My point is that there is no need to have 16 officers in the place of 11; so that even with this qualification, that the officers recruited will be provincial men, I still maintain my original proposition and press the motion to a division"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"One more misconception of my hon. friend, I may clear. He seems to think that I am going to have 16 officers in the place of 11. That is not an accurate statement. I have always had 15 permanent men on the cadre and I have, besides that, two temporary men sanctioned by the Secretary of State for charge of the sixth temporary party. But this number will always be changing places between the Government and the proprietors. So, if the totals on pages 34, 35 and 36 are taken together with reference to the actuals of the previous years, I can assure my hon. friend that I have not exceeded the sanctioned cadre at all; but on the other hand, I have provided for one officer less during the current year because an officer was abolished by the voting of the House last year. He was one of the two leave reserves provided for. I have, no doubt, asked for three more temporary men and that of course, the House has already sanctioned.

The motion was put and lost.

12th March 1923]

MOTION No. 16.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"Sir, I beg to move—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 8,400 for personal allowance for three officers.

Sir, there are different kinds of personal allowances, as we have heard from the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. Personal allowances are given to officers when they get less pay by reason of the revision of the pay and so on. To such personal allowances, I have no objection. But sometimes personal allowances are given to officers as a sort of supplemental pay. I do not know under what head these particular personal allowances come. If I hear either from the hon. the Revenue Member or from the hon. the Finance Member that these particular personal allowances come under the former category, that is, allowances given to officers on account of the revision of their pay, I will not press the motion to a division. But if, on the other hand, they are given as a sort of supplemental pay, then I must press the motion to a division."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"I may assure the hon. Member, Sir, that these allowances are exactly on the same analogy as the allowances granted to officers on account of the reduction of pay of the posts they held and which carried larger pay at the time they entered the service. These three are European officers who joined the service at a time when their pay was higher and which in 1905 was reduced. These personal allowances are therefore given to compensate them for the reduction of their pay."

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR :—"I do not press the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 17.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Sir, I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,20,000 for temporary establishment by one lakh.

Sir, at first sight, it may appear that I am attempting to make a drastic cut under this head. Hon. Members will notice that in the first instance in the original budget estimate for 1922-23, an allotment of Rs. 4,10,000 was provided, but in the revised estimate, we find the figure going up to Rs. 5,40,000; and when we come to the budget now under discussion we find an allotment of Rs. 5,20,000, i.e., Rs. 1,20,000 in excess of the original budget estimate for the year which is about to expire. I am fully conscious of the fact that I am attempting to make a very deep cut in this direction, but my only justification is that the times are out of joint and there would be absolutely no excuse for keeping up the old expenditure when we are confronted with a huge and heavy deficit. We must cut our coat according to the cloth, and unless we make up our minds for large cuts, it will, in the very nature of things, be impossible for us to balance the budget. It will be perfectly possible for the hon. the Revenue Member to be satisfied with this allotment less one lakh of rupees to keep the machinery going, and if need there be and if the circumstances imperatively demand it, he can come before the House some time later for a supplementary grant."

[12th March 1923]

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Sir, I support this as one who has given notice of a similar motion, and for the reason that it is economically unsound to have a large temporary establishment year to year. If necessary, some provision may be made for making a portion of the establishment permanent, so that they may have better prospects and may be induced to do their work more satisfactorily."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, my own impression was that I had explained at some great length why under the Survey, the cost, so far as the Government portion of it is concerned, must show some slight increase in the next year as compared with the current year. I have already told the House that whereas there are 5 parties working under Government for the current year, there will be so many as 7 parties working in the next year. There should certainly be a proportionate increase in expenditure. But what does the House find in this particular case? Instead of giving me credit for having budgeted for a less amount than what I had a right to do, I am told, 'You had better come up to us now for a nominal sum and get it sanctioned; don't tell us honestly now what your actual requirements are, but at a later stage come and tell us that the amount allotted was small, and ask for a supplementary grant.' What is the actual state of affairs? We find that the expenditure under this head in 1921-22, not even with 7 parties working, but with a less number, was Rs. 5,99,833. During the current year we budgeted for Rs. 4,10,000, and we find that we could not do with less than Rs. 5,40,000. Now, in the next year, instead of having 6 lakhs, I thought I had better economize, and I have budgeted only for Rs. 5,20,000, which is far, far less than the actuals of 1921-22 and Rs. 20,000 less than the demand for the current year, with only 5 parties working and with a possibility of 7 working next year. How then am I to accept this cut? The consequence will be that I will have to tell the survey parties that I shall not insist on the programme of work that I have laid down and they are to do as little work as they can and spread it over not 2 years but as many years as necessary. I do not think that will be the intention of the House."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I have many a time fallen a victim to the hypnotising speeches of the hon. the Revenue Member, but I think I stand on a firm ground on the present occasion. The year is certainly very bad, and we must make up our minds, even at the risk of becoming unpopular, to effect some cuts. As the hon. the Revenue Member said that he refused to accept this motion, likewise I refuse to withdraw it and press it to a division."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

MOTION No. 18.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 5,20,000 for temporary establishment by Rs. 20,000.

Sir, I have anticipated all the objections that may have been raised by the hon. the Revenue Member and I have given notice for a small reduction of Rs. 20,000 only. We have to meet some deficit and it is therefore necessary that we must make some cuts here and there. It is not at all my desire

12th March 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

that the hon. the Revenue Member should come with supplementary demands. I am one of those who are dead against supplementary demands. From what we have heard from the hon. the Revenue Member, even in this present Budget, he expects to be able to make some re-allotments whenever it is necessary. If he is able to make a re-allotment of Rs. 80,000 when 6 lakhs is necessary, and only Rs. 5,20,000 is granted, it will not be difficult for him to make a small re-allotment now. Last year they were able to re-allot Rs. 1,30,000. So, I think that the cut of Rs. 20,000 will not in any way displace all his survey parties or dislocate all their work."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I may say, Sir, that I have already made my cut under this head. If I am to cut it further and to distribute it amongst the seven survey parties, it will be rendering each party absolutely ineffectual. I have been asked that, while I have been able to do with less money, in the current year, why should I not do in a similar manner next year. I do not wish to alarm the House by the statement that the actual expenditure incurred up to 31st March was not available at the time when the Budget was prepared, and according to the recent figures of the Accountant-General it may probably become necessary to re-adjust the amount of expenditure in the course of our supplementary demands on the 27th. It may be that a particular allotment may have to be exceeded and it may be that there may be some saving under some provision, so that on the 27th March, when we come up with supplementary demands, it will then be time to consider whether these represent the actuals of expenditure budgeted for. So far as this particular allotment is concerned, I may say we have made a most careful calculation according to the rates and scales of travelling allowances that have been announced already and which are now in operation. If we are going to tie down the survey parties to particular places and if we are going to impede their progress from place to place, I do not know what a survey officer can possibly do. His duty in no place will be for more than a few days. From village to village, from hamlet to hamlet, from field to field, his duty extends from morning till evening. If you are going to tell him that he must restrict his travelling allowances, then I am afraid the quality of his work will seriously suffer. I have provided that sum for five survey parties during the current year. Rupees 90,000 was thought necessary for five survey parties during the current year. I have only asked for Rs. 80,000 during the next year for seven parties. That does not indicate anything like extravagance or that I am oblivious of the fact that cuts are necessary for the purpose of balancing the Budget. While I am agreed that we must balance the Budget to the best of our ability, I should also see that the balance of the department is not upset."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

MOTION No. 19.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Sir, I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for boundary pillars, measurers and hired labourers by 1 lakh.

Mr. President, it will be seen that this amount has enormously increased from the total sum of Rs. 4,147 in the year 1921-22. Last year we provided a sum of Rs. 5,000, Rs. 2,000 and Rs. 3,000 respectively. It is shown in the

[Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu] [12th March 1923]

revised estimate that Rs. 1,09,000 has actually been spent upon this. As I have already submitted, these survey parties are really not very beneficial to the public, because if they are once employed they always show that there is a good deal of work to do, and there will be settlement again and there will be further touching of the poor man's pocket. I fail to see why so much as Rs. 1,20,000 should be provided for. I think, Sir, Rs. 20,000 will be quite enough to meet this purpose for the next year. I hope that this motion will be accepted by Government."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, I confess, that, if one reads the budget figures as they are, it will certainly appear somewhat of a mystery as to how this insignificant expenditure of Rs. 4,147 in the year 1921-22 suddenly rose up to Rs. 1,09,000 in the current year, which it is proposed again to raise to Rs. 1,20,000. Under the system in vogue in the year 1921-22, the cost of survey stones, boundary pillars and everything incidental thereto which the Government was responsible for as its share for the survey of its lands was being paid by each Collector from out of the district budget. There was very little money that was being paid by the Superintendent or the Director, as he is now called, from his own budget. In the year 1921-22, this insignificant sum was incurred by the Superintendent presumably in regard to some of the items for which the District Collectors could not give him money.

"But the Accountant-General in the year 1922-23 told us distinctly
1-15 p.m. that according to the classification of various items of expenditure, the department which actually incurred the expenditure should provide the allotment. The survey parties incurred the expenditure. Ordinarily, the expenditure which they incur on behalf of the ryots is recovered from the ryots by means of bills which are delivered to them and recovered by the Revenue department. In the case of Government lands, the bills were sent to the Collector and the Collector, as the head of the administration of the district, paid them back to the Survey department so that the Survey department might recoup its expenditure. But in 1922-23 the Accountant-General drew our attention to the fact that this system of account keeping was not satisfactory, that the whole money instead of being divided into so many small items and going into district budgets should enter into the central budget and be controlled by the Director of Survey. In accordance with that dictum, I came up to this House; I obtained an allotment from them; they were good enough to sanction it to me on the 27th March 1922, in connexion with the discussion of the budget. And now what I propose to do is to carry into the next year's budget the same nature of transaction for which they have given their assent in March last. There is, therefore, nothing obviously inconsistent or incorrect. The only difference between the current year's budget and the next year's is a sum of Rs. 11,000. Need I repeat again—how often have I not repeated it—that the operation in the Government tracts this year is going to be on a much larger scale. As against five survey parties, seven are going to be in full operation and therefore a small increase of Rs. 11,000 has been entered in the budget which cannot certainly be regarded as extravagant. These, Sir, are the circumstances why the expenditure has come in."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU:—"Sir, I am one of those who gave notice of a motion for reduction under this item. The statement made by the hon. the Revenue Member satisfied me as to the variations in the

12th March 1923]* [Mr. T. Balaji Rao Nayudu]

figures for the current, the coming and the past years. I was one of the members of the Committee on the Survey and Boundaries Bill, and, if I remember aright, it was decided in that committee that the planting of stones should be done on a much smaller scale than before. That being so, the cost of planting stones ought to be considerably reduced. I cannot see how the cost under this head will in any case rise over that of last year. In the absence of any explanation as to what the effect of the change recently made would be on the number of stones, there is no justification at all for an increase of expenditure. I, therefore, urge my proposition to reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,20,000 for boundary pillars, measurers, and hired labourers by Rs. 60,000."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Sir, the question before the committee to which my hon. friend referred was not in the manner in which he put it. The question was whether more stones should be planted than at present and the decision of the committee was that there need not be any further increase. I cannot refrain from mentioning that in the committee's report there was a suggestion that permanent pillars might be fixed to indicate the boundary line between Government land and private land. But calculating the total expenditure that the Government will have to incur on that account, I found that 84 lakhs would be necessary. I do not come to the House for sanction of the amount, for I regard such a provision as unnecessary. There is no attempt now made for the purpose of fixing more stones than are being planted under the existing system—the system which was placed before the committee, and which the committee was given every opportunity to examine threadbare, the system which the committee after mature deliberation was of opinion must be continued intact. I am merely carrying out the opinion of the committee and not doing anything more. The extra 11,000 is not because I want to spend more money on items of expenditure not incurred up to now but that is a fraction of the additional expenditure which would be incurred by the working of seven survey parties next year in lieu of five this year."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" I have nothing more to add, Sir, except to say that I press my motion."

The motion was put and declared lost.

The motion of Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu was then put and declared lost.

MOTION No. 20.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—" Sir, I beg to move—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for charge allowance.

Sir, on a similar motion to omit charge allowances, the hon. the Revenue Member said that if he reduced the allowance in one case and not in others, it would produce great heart-burning. I am therefore trying to remove this heart-burning by moving for the omission in all cases. This charge allowance, Sir, refers to the two temporary Assistant Directors, page 36 of the Budget. One other reason the hon. the Revenue Member urged was that the allowance was given because it was necessary to pay an additional sum to the superior officer getting only a little over his subordinate. So far as this item is concerned, I find that both these Assistant Directors are started on

[Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai] [12th March 1923.]

Rs. 350. Therefore, I submit that the reasons urged by the hon. Member do not apply to this case. On the principle already accepted that the charge allowances should go, I beg to move for the reduction."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, I have nothing more to urge than what I have already stated times without number. The only reason that my hon. friend seems to confront me with on this occasion is that I made a statement that of the two officers who are put in charge of a party, the senior officer who is responsible for the work does get a charge allowance while the other does not get any. He tells me that on page 36 of the Budget, provision has been made for two Assistant Directors on equal pay and therefore he comes to the logical conclusion that because both are drawing equal pay neither should get anything more. I thought I had said that it was not because of the change in position, it was not because of the fact that one was higher in the grade and the other was lower that we respected seniority and gave Rs. 100 as charge allowance. It is not that we wanted to give it to that man who already possessed most and deny it to that man who possessed least; the burden of my whole song has been that we give it to one of the two who is given the direct charge of the party for the additional work, for the additional responsibilities that are involved, and that, and that alone, is the compensation represented by this sum of Rs. 100. I need not say anything more."

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI:—"I do not believe, Sir, that the hon. the Revenue Member's speech requires any answer."

The motion was put and the House divided thus:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 13. Diwan Bahadur S. Rm. M. Ct. Pethachi Chettiyar. |
| 2. Mr. C. Ramalinga Reddi. | 14. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 3. " B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 15. Mr. C. V. Venkataratnam Ayyangar. |
| 4. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 16. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 5. " M. Narayanawami Reddi. | 17. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhaacharlu. |
| 6. " V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai. | 18. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 7. " W. P. A. Saundarapandya Nadar. | 19. Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 8. " E. K. Shanmukham Chettiyar. | 20. " M. R. Sethurathnam Ayyar. |
| 9. " T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. | 21. " T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 10. " A. Tangavelu Nayagar. | 22. The Raja of Ramnad. |
| 11. " V. C. Vellingiri Gounder. | |
| 12. Rao Bahadur C. Venkata Ranga Reddi. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 18. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Funja. |
| 2. " Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib. | 19. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai. |
| 3. " the Raja of Panagal. | 20. " S. Muttumanikkaachari. |
| 4. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu. | 21. Rev. W. Meston. |
| 5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 22. Mr. C. R. T. Congrove. |
| 6. " Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 23. Saiyid Muhammad Padsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7. " C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 24. Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur. |
| 8. Mr. E. S. Lloyd. | 25. Khan Bahadur Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 9. " A. Y. G. Campbell. | 26. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsba Sahib Bahadur. |
| 10. Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai. | 27. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 11. Mr. E. F. Thomas. | 28. Rao Sahib M. C. Madurai Pillai. |
| 12. " E. Periyannayagam. | 29. " P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 13. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | 30. Mr. A. M. MacDougall. |
| 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 31. Rao Bahadur T. Namburam Chettiyar. |
| 15. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 32. Mr. A. E. Rencontre. |
| 16. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 33. " C. E. Wood. |
| 17. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | |

12th March 1923]

The motion was lost.

The House adjourned for lunch at 1-30 p.m.

The Council assembled after lunch at 2-34 p.m., the hon. the Deputy President presiding.

MOTION No. 21.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, I beg to move—

That the allotment of Rs. 13,50,400 for Revenue Survey be reduced by Rs. 100.

I just want to invite the attention of the hon. the Revenue Member to two or three points. At present, whenever a Revenue Inspector renews or repairs stones, he charges for each stone renewed or repaired by him a fee of eight annas, as representing his labour. Originally, the charge was only four annas a stone. Now, I submit to the House that this increase of the rate from four to eight annas is not at all justifiable. It is very well known that there were separate Land Records Revenue Inspectors to look after this work. These have been done away with, and they have been merged in the general establishment. If we calculate the number of stones attended to by each Revenue Inspector, I think we shall find that they renew or repair about 5×70 or 350 stones in a taluk, that is to say, they charge from the ryots a sum of Rs. 175; whereas the labour involved in the renewal or repair of these stones would be represented by the cost of one inspector at Rs. 50 a month, plus his travelling allowance and the pay of his peon, if any. It is quite clear, therefore, that the recoveries actually made now are twice as much as the amount that should be legitimately recovered by the Government. This is an infliction on the ryots. I suggest for the consideration of the hon. the Revenue Member that he should revert to the old rate of four annas per stone; and I appeal to the House to enforce my request by passing this motion for reduction by Rs. 100."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" I was not quite aware, Sir, as to what particular matter would be referred to by the hon. Member in his speech on his motion for reduction by Rs. 100. Now that he has drawn my attention to the particular item of the charges recovered on account of the repair of stones and complain that the rate levied at the present moment is higher than what is justifiable, I promise that I shall look into the matter."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" I am satisfied with the assurance, Sir, and I would withdraw the motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 22.

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—" Mr. President, I beg to move—

That the allotment of Rs. 13,800 for the special pay of Special Assistant Settlement Officers, be omitted.

At the bottom of page 37 of the Budget estimate we find that a sum of Rs. 13,800 has been provided for the special pay of Special Assistant Settlement Officers, 9 (100), 1 (100), for seven months, 3 (100) for six months; and 1 (100) for five months. Therefore, all told, the officers come up to 14, and the amount of Rs. 13,800 put in the budget comes under the head of special pay. Regard being had to the fact that the pay of these Special

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

[12th March 1923]

Assistant Settlement Officers was recently revised, there is no reason why a large number of them should be allowed to draw special pay at the rate of Rs. 100 a month, and sufficient justification does not seem to exist for this item."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, I think I will have to weary the House with a little history connected with the grant of this allowance; and I maintain that even with the pay and the allowance which is being given to these officers, the department is working on the most economical lines. Prior to the year 1902, the Settlement Department was self-contained in the matter of its officers. It consisted of a superior staff containing two Deputy Commissioners, first grade, on Rs. 1,100 per mensem each, two Deputy Commissioners on Rs. 750 per mensem, and two Assistant Commissioners on Rs. 425 to Rs. 550 per mensem. In the year 1902, the Government took up for consideration the question whether it was necessary to retain a separate cadre for the purpose of conducting the settlement operations in this Presidency, or whether they might not utilize the services of Deputy Collectors for doing the work, regard being had to the fact that the nature of the duties which they would in future be called upon to perform as Special Settlement or Special Assistant Settlement Officers would be more exacting, more taxing and more onerous, and therefore the small allowance attached to their grade pay might very well meet the requirements of the case. That question was considered, and the Government came to the conclusion that that was the most economical way of conducting settlement operations. From that time forwards, a Special Settlement Department with a very costly set of officers disappeared. The other advantage that was gained by the substitution of this new arrangement was this. Under the old arrangement, the Settlement Department had a fixed permanent cadre, and whether there was work for it or not, the officers had to go on; whereas, at the present moment, the number of officers recruited or rather drafted from the Deputy Collector's cadre and from the Indian Civil Service cadre for the purpose of doing settlement work, depends upon the quantity of work which has got to be done. Therefore, each year, the number of officers employed varies. This year it may be half a dozen; next year it may be twelve; and in the third year there may be none. For, these officers who are drawn for the purpose of working in the Settlement Department have their own permanent fixed appointments. As soon as the settlement operations on which they are engaged are terminated, they revert automatically to their respective places, and there is therefore practically no expenditure specially incurred on behalf of the Settlement Department, if there is no resettlement work to do. Then, Sir, the question was considered as to whether these officers should work on the grade pay which they were drawing. Hon. Members of the House know that the pay of a Deputy Collector at the present moment ranges from Rs. 300 to Rs. 850. It will probably be very hard that men who have reached the topmost part of the tree should be asked to serve as Settlement Officers, for it goes without saying that such men will be sufficiently old not to be able to shoulder the very arduous duties which the work of a Settlement Officer necessarily involves. We have therefore to pick and choose, and while trying to pick and choose, we have necessarily to appoint only such men who we think are sufficiently active, do not disdain out-door work, will be on tour for as long a period as the work may demand, do not return to

12th March 1923] [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

their headquarters for months together although they may feel home sick, and do their work in the briefest possible period.

• “The Government of India, Sir, while describing the nature of officers that they would expect to be appointed for settlement work, have
2-45 p.m. distinctly told us that

the work of re-assessment, even when unaccompanied by a work of revision of soil classification, offers problems which must always render it worthy of being undertaken by men of ability and good judgment; the method in which the work is accomplished affects the conditions of the cultivating classes, as no other measure of administration and the enquiries incidental to settlement afford the officer to whom they are committed a knowledge of the people and a revenue training which is useful to him throughout his services.

That, Sir, summarizes the nature of the duties which the Settlement Officer or the Assistant Settlement Officer is engaged upon. To say that the Deputy Collector with his ordinary cadre of pay should be asked to be converted into Settlement Officer or Assistant Settlement Officer would be asking rather too much. We shall then be denied the opportunity of selecting the best men available. The best man available when he sees that he is more comfortable where he is as Revenue Divisional Officer or Treasury Deputy Collector and that by accepting the office of Settlement Officer or Assistant Settlement Officer he is in no way pecuniarily benefited but that he has to incur a large expenditure out of his pocket for the purpose of spending a number of months in villages and in touring through the several parts of the district, will necessarily say, ‘No, thanks’ when the offer is made to him. It will also be cruel to penalize a good officer by forcing him to any appointment when we really feel that it means more work, more responsibility, more self-sacrifice, more physical exertion and more brain work, and yet tell him that we shall not remunerate him for this additional work but that he should be content with the pay which he was drawing in positions in which he did not require, so to say, a combination of these virtues. The best man would thereby be precluded from taking up this office, and the Government would be precluded from choosing the best men that they think fit for these appointments. After all, some people who probably want to avoid the Revenue Divisional Officer's work for personal reasons, or who may probably try to get a transfer from a particular district for certain reasons might offer themselves for the time being, and when they have marked their time for a month or two might take leave and go away, with the result that the settlement work which is so important, as the Government of India have laid down, will suffer, for want of a continuity of policy and frequent changing of hands.

“These allowances, Sir, were put before the Retrenchment Committee and the Retrenchment Committee, which fortunately possesses an officer who has himself been a Special Settlement Officer and who knows the work of the Special Settlement Officer by direct experience, have recommended that these allowances should be sanctioned in the case of the Special Settlement Officers and the Assistant Special Settlement Officers. It was only on the authority of the Retrenchment Committee that I have included this amount in the Budget, and I hope, Sir, that the House will be pleased to sanction it. We put up this case before the Retrenchment Committee with a small summary of the work, and we pointed out the necessity for these allowances in view of the nature of the duties involved, the difficulty with which the Government will be faced in finding the best men for these appointments, the loss of efficiency which the withdrawal of the allowance will therefore cause, the

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]

highly economic system now in vogue as compared with the previous system when there was a highly paid special cadre for doing the same work. I may also inform the House that several Settlement Officers and Assistant Settlement Officers drawn from the cadre of Deputy Collectors have been appealing to me rather repeatedly that they may be relieved of this special settlement work and sent back to their respective divisions or treasuries where they were originally serving. But in the interests of Government, I could not do so. At the same time, I feel that it will be too hard not to continue to give this allowance for work other than that for which they were intended or their cadre pay was fixed. I have therefore ventured to include this amount in the Budget; and I hope that I will have the entire opinion of the House with me in asking for this vote."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, my excuse for rising now is the reference made to the Retrenchment Committee. If I remember right, the Retrenchment Committee considered this question and they thought that this allowance to all Settlement Officers would not be justifiable. They made a difference between cases where Settlement Officers were in charge of parties and those where they were not in charge of them. The Retrenchment Committee, if I remember right, said that an allowance might be given to officers in charge of settlement parties. But in the case of Assistant Settlement Officers, they thought that no such allowance would be justified. The same was the case in the Survey Department also. There also they thought that the ordinary Survey Officer was not entitled to an allowance, but a Survey Officer in charge of a party should be given an allowance. In both the cases in which they justified the allowance, their recommendation was based on this fact: that the officer who was in charge of a party was doing a more responsible work and that he had some more responsibility assigned to him than that of an ordinary Settlement Officer or Survey Officer. It was on that ground that the charge allowance was recommended by the Retrenchment Committee in the case of only those who were in charge of parties.

(At this stage, the hon. Member was handed the paper containing the recommendation of the Retrenchment Committee on the matter by the Finance Secretary.)

"I see here that the Retrenchment Committee by a narrow majority favoured the granting of an allowance also to those officers not in charge of parties on the ground of the arduous nature of the work. My impression was that the Committee sanctioned it only in the case of those who were in charge of parties. But I find that 'by a narrow majority' the Committee were in favour of giving it to all the officers. That shows that a considerable body of opinion in the Retrenchment Committee was not in favour of granting it to all the officers but were for paying only to the officers in charge of parties. My position with reference to this is this: these are officers who are borne on the general cadre of Deputy Collectors. It is not that the Deputy Collectors when they were recruited did not know that they would be detailed for settlement or survey duty. They know that they can be detailed for settlement duty at any time, and these officers are borne on the cadre of Deputy Collectors. Such being the case, I do not see, Sir, that there is any justification for giving a special allowance for the officers who may be chosen for this particular work. If they are going to say that this particular work is difficult, the same may be said of any other

12th March 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

work. It can be very well said that an officer might decline to go to a particular division or he would like to go to a lighter division. If that is the sort of consideration which ought to weigh with the head of the department who is transferring people and who is posting men for particular duties, then I can find no use in having a cadre for particular appointments. Therefore, I consider there is no justification whatsoever for giving the allowance for posting a particular officer to one duty rather than another. It is only in cases where an officer is posted for a duty outside the cadre that any question of allowance can arise. Then, it may be that the head of the department concerned may consider whether it involves any additional duty or more arduous work; but that is a different matter altogether. When a particular duty is included in the cadre itself, I beg to submit there is absolutely no justification whatever for giving an allowance in such cases. On that ground, Sir, I object to this allowance, and I support the motion that has been made.

“As I said, I am prepared to make a reservation with reference to those officers who are actually in charge of parties; and I believe, Sir, that these are not the persons included in this motion, which deals with the special pay of Special Assistant Settlement Officers. That shows they are not persons who are in charge of parties. So, I very heartily support this motion.”

MR. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“Sir, I have heard the reasons advanced by the hon. the Revenue Member as to why these officers should be paid a special allowance. It was stated that proper men from the cadre of Deputy Collectors might not be willing to take up this work unless they were paid an extra allowance. The same reasons were urged this morning with regard to the allowances that were paid to Deputy Collectors posted for revision of adangals in whose case this House cut down the special pay. If that is the only reason why special allowance should be paid to the Settlement Officers, I think in this case also the House will not be able to accept the reasons. The only reason for giving the Deputy Collectors a higher pay should not be that it ought to serve as an inducement to go and serve as Settlement Officers. It was stated that in the Retrenchment Committee the decision was not unanimous and that it was carried by a narrow majority. This Council, therefore, need not feel bound to accept the decision of that narrow majority. In these circumstances, I submit that this motion may be accepted.”

THE HON. SIR CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“I should just like to make one or two points quite clear. The Assistant Settlement Officer may be in charge of a party; Sir, I take it, that so far as officers in charge of parties are concerned, the House is prepared to let the allowance stand. If we only have left the question of an officer not in charge of a party, we have to consider a more open question. The question is whether an allowance is necessary on account of the arduous nature of the work. There is no doubt, as Mr. Moir explained on a previous occasion in this House, that the work is exceedingly arduous and that to the men of the class of Deputy Collectors it is very distasteful to work out of doors all day in the heat and in the sun fight through the hot weather and so on. It is a very trying work for an elderly man of sedentary habits, and it does affect him seriously. We have had cases of men who died of exposure. This is the sole point at issue. Is it fair to take an elderly man of sedentary habits and send him

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[12th March 1923]

out to do arduous field work, risking his health, and make him do it without paying anything extra for it?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, my hon. friend at my back who is a member of the Finance cum Retrenchment Committee raised one question. He asked why if the Deputy Collectors were borne on the cadre of Deputy Collectors they are asked to do any other kind of work which Government might command them to do and why they should ask for a special allowance at all. He put it in his own way that they knew at the time they entered the service that there were varieties of duties which they might be drafted into, which they should have to do and for which they had no right to demand a special allowance. But may I point out to the hon. Member, Sir, that at the time these Deputy Collectors entered the service, at the time their present cadre was fixed, there was a separate allowance for doing this additional work. They entered the service with the distinct knowledge, with the distinct hope and with the distinct encouragement that, if taken away from their ordinary line of work and posted to do duties of this nature, they would get not merely the pay of their cadre but also the allowances which have been earmarked for the duty. Now, the proposal is to take away the allowance from them. I think that the burden of the proof has now been shifted on to my shoulders for convincing these people that although they entered the service with the hope that they would get the special pay—a hope in which they had every right to be supported by reason of their experience—I was sorry to say that they could no more hope to get this allowance. The answer I am asked to give is that, when they entered service, the special duties of Assistant Settlement Officers and Special Settlement Officers were considered arduous but that they are no more considered as such. With my little knowledge of land revenue administration—I have not been a Revenue Officer previously—and with my little knowledge of the inspections I have had of the settlement parties in the various parts of the Presidency, I must confess that this answer will be wholly unjustifiable.

"If the one is a Special Settlement Officer, the other is a Deputy Collector having a definite jurisdiction. The nature of the duties which they have to perform is more or less akin. If the one gets the allowance and the other does not get it, I am afraid it will cause great discontent. I would, therefore, very strongly press for the retention of this allowance to both, particularly in view of the fact that the Retrenchment Committee was good enough to see the reasonableness of the request that the allowance should be continued to the Special and Assistant Settlement Officers."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR:—"Sir, I very strongly press this motion.

3 p.m.

Neither the hon. the Finance Member nor the hon. the Revenue Member has succeeded in convincing me that these allowances should continue to be paid. As remarked by my hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, when a man rises to the cadre of a Deputy Collector, I do not think there is any understanding or compact between him and the Government that he should be asked to do only a particular kind of work and that in the event of his being called upon to do some other kind of work or being put in charge of some other department, he should be paid any extra allowance which the labour of that department might entail. This is a very bad principle, and it is a vicious and reprehensible one.

12th March 1923]

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

“Sir, reference was made to the narrow majority in the Retrenchment Committee. I hope that the voice of this House on this question will assert itself to the extent of reducing that narrow majority into a hopeless minority.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“If all the arguments that I have already advanced in the course of my remarks have not succeeded in bringing my hon. friend to my line of thought, I must only repeat them again. My hon. friend, Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar, has only repeated the arguments advanced by my hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, which I thought I had already demolished most successfully. I already pointed out that when these men entered the Government service, they did not contract for this kind of work. If they are called upon to perform a piece of work for which there has been special allowance for years past, they should not be deprived of this allowance suddenly. So long as these allowances are part and parcel of the conditions of service, I maintain that it would not be proper to withdraw them now.

“It was stated by my hon. friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, that what the Committee intended was that these allowances should be given only in the case of Indian Settlement Officers in charge of settlement parties and that they should not be given to Assistant Settlement Officers. At the present moment, there is only one Indian officer in charge of a settlement party, and all the other Indian officers happen to be Assistant Settlement officers. Well, Sir, if the sympathy of the House will restrict itself to the narrow extent of sanctioning the allowance only to one officer out of eleven who are doing similar duties, I should think that it is a very poor recompense to those who are going to lose the allowances.

“I think, Sir, that my hon. friend, Mr. Seturatnam Ayyar, who is representing the Trichinopoly district, will bear me out when I say that the nature of the duties performed by the Settlement and the Assistant Settlement Officers has not been exaggerated by me. I had the good fortune to visit the Trichinopoly district, and I inspected the work done there by the Settlement Officers. My hon. friend accompanied me throughout the inspection—I am very grateful to him for his kindness—and I am sure he has observed with his own eyes the very arduous duties performed by the Settlement Officers. Sun or no sun, rain or no rain, shelter or no shelter, they have to do their work. They personally told me that when once they got to the fields, they would not be able to return until 2 or 3 o'clock in the evening, and, during the whole of this period, they had to live on the bottle of water which they carried with them. When I went for the inspection along with them I could not take my breakfast at the usual hour of 10-30 in the morning. I do not remember a single day on which I was able to take my breakfast before 1 o'clock, although it was not incumbent upon me to wait till such a late hour. I should certainly be glad to take my hon. friend, Mr. Srinivasa Ayyangar, along with me while I go on inspection of these settlement parties so that he might see and satisfy himself about the nature of the duties which these officers are called upon to perform.”

MR. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“How does that materially differ from the nature of the work which the ordinary Deputy Collectors are called upon to perform?”

[12th March 1923]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"If my hon. friend accompanies me in my inspection work, he will understand in what respects the nature of the work differs. The Revenue Divisional Officer and the Treasury Deputy Collector have a well-defined and well-chalked out programme of work to attend to. They can go to villages where they can get good shelter and where all their conveniences will be properly attended to. But that is not the case with Settlement Officers. No option is given to them in the matter of selecting villages to which they have to go. They must go to all the villages where they have got work and they must stay there for the full period which their duty requires them to do in spite of all the inconveniences and hardships that might be caused to them thereby. Under these circumstances, I hope that the House will have some sympathy for them. I am pleading very hard for them and I feel that I cannot get the very best men for this kind of work, if the House does not help me to this small extent of retaining the allowances. I have not pleaded so hard in the case of other allowances; but in the case of Special Settlement Officers, I do plead that they should be paid the allowances to which they are entitled, by reason of the nature of the work which they are performing."

The motion was put and declared lost.

Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar then demanded a poll.

Before the poll was taken, the hon. Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib requested the hon. the Deputy President to split up the motion into two—one relating to allowances to the Settlement Officers in charge of parties and the other relating to the allowances to those who are not in charge of parties.

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"With reference to the suggestion of my hon. colleague, may I seek the permission of the House to split up the motion into two portions? The first portion is to —

omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for Special Assistant Settlement Officers who are in charge of parties.

"The second portion is —

to omit the allotment of Rs. 12,600 for Assistant Settlement Officers who are not in charge of parties.

"I think, Sir, that some hon. Members would like to retain the allowances in the case of Settlement Officers who are in charge of parties."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—"I have already put to the House the motion as it stands on the agenda, and I do not know whether I can go back upon it. The House will vote upon the motion as it stands."

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 10. Mr. V. Pakkiriswami Pillai. |
| 2. Mr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 11. " M. Narayanaswami Reddi. |
| 3. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar. | 12. " W. P. A. Saundarapandiya Nadar. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajulu Nayudu. | 13. " K. Sitarama Reddi. |
| 5. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. Iyagaraya Chettiyar. | 14. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 6. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 15. Mr. A. Iyagavelu Nayagar. |
| 7. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 16. " V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. |
| 8. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 17. " C. Venkataranga Reddi. |
| 9. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | 18. Diwan Bahadur Pethaabi Chettiyar. |
| | 19. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimba Raju. |

12th March 1923]

Ayes—cont.

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 20. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar. | 24. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao. |
| 21. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu. | 25. Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 22. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu. | 26. „ T. Arumainatha Pillai. |
| 23. Rao Bahadur Dr. C. B. Rama Rao. | 27. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Masarennhas. |
| | 28. Mr. T. Sivasankaram Pillai. |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 15. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. |
| 2. „ Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib. | 16. „ S. Somasundaram Pillai. |
| 3. „ the Raja of Panagal. | 17. „ M. Suryanarayana. |
| 4. „ Rai Bahadur K. Venkatreddi Nayudu. | 18. „ S. Muttumanikkachari. |
| 5. „ „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 19. „ C. R. T. Congreve. |
| 6. „ Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 20. Saiyid „Diwan Abdul Razaak Sahib Bahadur. |
| 7. „ Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 21. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib Bahadur. |
| 8. Mr. E. S. Lloyd. | 22. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur. |
| 9. „ A. Y. G. Campbell. | 23. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| 10. Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai. | 24. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 11. Mr. E. F. Thomas. | 25. Mr. A. J. Leech. |
| 12. „ E. Periyannayagam. | 26. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar. |
| 13. Rao Sahib T. C. Tanavelu Pillai. | |
| 14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | |

The motion was declared carried, 28 having voted *for* and 26 *against*.

MOTION No. 23.

3-15 p.m. Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—“ Mr. President, I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,95,000 for temporary establishment by Rs. 1,00,000.

It will be seen, Sir, that the provision for the Budget year is nearly Rs. 93,000 more than the revised estimate for the current year, and the actuals for 1921-22 were only Rs. 2,45,000. On principle, as I have already submitted, I am always opposed to this kind of temporary establishments. Their work is always half-hearted as they have no prospects, being always temporary. Consequently, I say that economically this kind of large temporary establishments at a huge cost of Rs. 3,95,000 is rather extravagant on our part to spend. I therefore propose, Sir, that a reduction of one lakh of rupees be made under this head.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“ Sir, I have again to begin from the very beginning. I have already, I think, told the House more often than once that the bulk of the temporary establishments and their cost are factors which depend not upon the voracious appetite of the Member to secure as much money as he can, but upon the actual needs of the department in a year. I have said, and I repeat, that as against five survey parties busy in Government work this year, there will be seven next year. I have already, I believe, tried to induce the House not to regard the allotments that have been entered for the next year as the maximum that I want for the work that is going to be done, and that before I entered the allotments under these heads, I have myself exercised a great deal of retrenchment in regard to them. I have myself reduced almost mercilessly the allotments which have been asked for by the departments concerned, and the Finance Department, that ever vigilant department, has done its share of work as well. So, as a result of so much distillation, what is remaining in the Budget is hardly sufficient for the nature of the work.

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]

"The settlement operations, as the House may know, are now in full swing in certain districts of the Presidency. The reason why a few more men are asked for next year is the fact that in Tanjore and Trichinopoly the work to be done is much larger than the work that has been done in the current year. In the Tanjore district, for instance, we require no more than Rs. 1,06,408 for expenditure during the current year, whereas for the next year we want no less than Rs. 1,57,369. The House is aware that the work of the Tanjore settlement party has advanced to such an extent as not to be interrupted. Were it interrupted, the House must be prepared for a loss of revenue to the tune of 14 to 15 lakhs. In the Trichinopoly district, where also the settlement operations may be regarded to be in full swing, the expenditure that was expected to be incurred under settlement operations during the current year was only Rs. 63,954, whereas in the next year we want no less a sum than Rs. 1,14,372. In the case of other settlement parties there is no increase worth the name. There is an appreciable decrease of expenditure in the South Arcot district; for, that district may be regarded to have almost completed its work. The total, Sir, that I actually need for the next year is Rs. 4,38,087, but as against that, the allotment which I have entered in the Budget is far far less. How then, Sir, is work going to be done?"

"I have been told that it is a pernicious system to embark upon the policy of taking on temporary men, that it is very pernicious to continue in that policy, that some unwholesome results must come out of that and that I must make all these men permanent. I thank the House for that advice and I shall see if I cannot make permanent more men both in the Settlement and the Survey departments so as to avoid coming before the House with so many motions and troubling it to scrutinize the increase relating to temporary establishments. If this had been a permanent establishment, I take it, it would have automatically formed part of the entire organization and would have been regarded as obligatory, but because we are working in this economical way, we are found fault with. As I said, the number of men must vary from year to year. It must vary in the same proportion as there is work to do. This expenditure limited to the barest minimum. The provision for next year is far less than what we ourselves—according to the strictest calculations—have been able to arrive at. If it is reduced further, the operations in the Trichinopoly and Tanjore districts, which are expected to cost more in the next year, will be conducted on less efficient lines, and, therefore, instead of being finished in one year, the work will naturally take us two years. I am not quite sure whether that can be regarded as sound financial policy."

Mr. E. S. LLOYD:—"Sir, I should like also just to say that this particular item was very carefully examined in the Finance Department, that department always being very keen to cut down temporary establishments whenever they can. But the Board of Revenue did, as a matter of fact, give very good reasons and very detailed figures under each head; and, as the hon. the Revenue Member has told the House, they asked originally as much as Rs. 4,38,000 and odd. It was only with very great difficulty that we were able to cut it down to the present figure of Rs. 3,95,000. Therefore, if this is going to be cut down still further, I do not think it will be possible for us to get through the work next year."

12th March 1923].

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"As long as Government have not come to the end of these temporary establishments, I think they will have to begin from the very beginning whenever this question arises. It is assumed by the Government that these settlement parties must exist and that they must also continue and increase in number. I object, Sir, to this principle so long as Government delay fixing the principles of settlement which the people have always been anxiously expecting to have. Now, instead of fixing the principles of settlement once for all and conducting operations on fixed principles, if the Government begin to employ temporary establishments year by year and go on increasing them, are we not entitled to say: 'Well, Sir, you have not fulfilled your portion of the promise; on the other hand, you have been increasing the establishment year by year? Therefore, let there be a stop to such kind of work by the Government?' I therefore cannot understand, Sir, when the Government argue, 'we have got more work to do and therefore we have to establish more persons to do the work'. I contend, Sir, that to go on saying that there is more work is not at all proper. Therefore, I think, Sir, that I must press this motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"I do not think I am prepared to admit the charge that Government have delayed deliberately to fix by Statute the principles underlying resettlements. That question, I think, has been discussed more often than once within the four walls of this House and I have tried to explain the exact position as to where we are. We were anxious in common with the House to get legislation passed; but owing to some circumstance or other, which I think I need not dilate upon at the present moment, that legislation could not come up before the House. The whole question is still in the hands of the Government of India and we have received no definite answer as to their attitude on it. That explains, Sir, our present position."

"Then it has been said, Sir, that Government go on increasing settlement work from year to year and in proportion to their activities in that direction, they go on increasing the extra establishment, both permanent and temporary. But I hope the hon. Member is aware that in the case of these resettlements they are not conducted by the Government at their sweet will and pleasure, but that there are certain rules for the purpose of resettlement. No resettlement can take place within less than thirty years. A district which was settled thirty years ago must be resettled at the expiry of that period. If we are going to delay the resettlement of that district, are we not inflicting an injury on other districts which get resettled immediately after the expiry of the thirty years? Are we not then treating one district more favourably than another? The number of the districts to be resettled therefore is not arrived at by any indefinite rule and is not determined by the sweet will and pleasure of the Government, but rather by the fact that in the case of so many districts the thirty years period will automatically expire in a particular year. When it expires, we have to take up the resettlement work of the districts concerned whether we like it or not; and the resettlement is thus determined only by the thirty-year factor. In one year there may be no district which is ready to be resettled; in another year there may be a large number of districts; and in a third year, the number may be very few. So, the work is not determined according to our own sweet will and pleasure, but it is determined by

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]
the thirty-year factor. And when that period expires, Government have to take up the work of resettlement; and they cannot lessen that work because the work has to be done as indeed it must."

The motion was put to the House and lost.

MOTION No. 24.

MR. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI:—"Sir, I beg to move—

3-30 p.m.

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,81,200 for settlement parties by Rs. 70,000.

Sir, we are told that the Government is handicapped by the iniquitous impost or our contribution to the Central Government. Since the commencement of the Reforms we have adopted a policy of retrenchment. I shall not dwell upon the way in which the Government is carrying on this policy, and how before the Reforms were introduced they gave their officials extraordinary increases in their salaries and how this has served to wipe off what surplus we had. As a result of the retrenchment we have effected, the temporary establishments have enormously increased. On page 38 of the budget estimate, there is a provision of Rs. 3,95,000 for temporary establishments which in the previous year was only Rs. 3,02,000. Not only is the expenditure on permanent establishment increasing year after year, but also the pay of the higher officials is increased when a few clerks and peons are reduced. In some departments the number of officers is reduced while in others it is increased. For instance, on page 34, there is a reduction in the number of Assistant Directors by two, on page 35, by one Assistant Director and on page 37 by two Special Settlement officers. In all, about five officers have been shown as reduced; but, in fact, they have been only transferred to some other department. Because, when we look at page 35 we find that four Assistant Directors have been newly appointed besides two probationers. So, for five men transferred from one office, six new men are appointed in another office. It seems to me that this is retrenchment with a vengeance. The actual expenditure in 1921-22 was 6.08 lakhs and the revised estimate for 1922-23 is 6.32 lakhs. The budget figure for the next year shows 7.81 lakhs which is 1.49 in excess of last year. So, what is the good of saying that we are applying the retrenchment axe to all the departments when we see the expenditure going up by leaps and bounds. When we are going on increasing our expenditure in this manner, how can we ask the Central Government to give us relief? The Central Government also might be going on in this manner. So, what we ought to do is that, though we cannot reduce our expenditure, we must at least see that it is in no way increased. Our expenditure has been increasing out of all proportion to our income, and if this state of affairs continues, we may not see the day when our deficit will vanish. With these few words I propose the allotment of Rs. 7,81,200 be reduced by Rs. 70,000."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I think, Sir, from what I heard the hon. Member say, he has taken a survey of the position of affairs in the Survey Department as well as in the Settlement Department during the current as compared with the next year and he says quite accurately indeed that the amount entered in the next year's budget is somewhat larger than that entered in the current year's budget. I had imagined, and now I find that I was wrong in that imagination, that when particular motions for omission or reduction under

12th March 1923]. [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

the Survey and Settlement Departments came up for discussion I had explained to the House the reasons why a particular amount was entered in the budget. The main reason which I urged, and which I shall again urge, was that the bulk of the work to be done next year both in the Survey Department and in the Settlement Department though large is nobody's fault. Districts have to be surveyed according to a programme previously made out, and resettlement has to be carried on as I have already said as the thirty-year period expires. If, therefore, more Settlement or Survey parties have to be employed next year as against those in the current year, it is because the work that has to be done in Tanjore and Trichinopoly is much larger than what it has been in the current year. Therefore, it will no doubt cost more, and I do not see who is to blame. It is probably time that has to be blamed. The years go on rolling and the thirty-year period unfortunately ends at a particular psychological moment and I have to resurvey and settle the particular district where that period ends. Well, I blame time, but I cannot see how I can accept an indefinite cut of Rs. 70,000 from a total allotment. I shall not weary the House with all the details which go to make up the total of the next year's allotment. I have from time to time read extracts relating to particular items, and if I should now try to weary the House I should probably re-read the whole of the statement which I have already read. Therefore, Sir, while I confess that there is a little increase in the next year's budget, I think I have shown very good reasons why that increase has been provided for.

“My friend on this side of the House (Mr. Pakkiriswami Pillai) tried to show something about the number of officers employed. He said that I had been transferring one set of officers from one district on to the other and vice versa. In regard to that point also I told the House that I possess altogether a permanent cadre of 14 Survey officers and a temporary cadre of 2 Survey officers, and that from time to time I take on as many temporary officers in the Survey Department as there are parties to work. A large number of these are generally engaged on Government work and a smaller number on proprietary work. The number on Government work depends upon the quantity of that work which has to be done and the number engaged on proprietary work depends upon the applications received from the proprietors to survey their estates. These are all varying factors for which neither the Government nor the Member in charge nor again the Survey Department is responsible. These factors go on moulding themselves, and as they go on moulding themselves, I have got to adjust the department accordingly. I can assure the hon. mover that there is no over-budgeting and I can say that I am not at all responsible for any deficit that has been produced. I can also assure the hon. mover that a small cut of Rs. 70,000 from our expenditure would not induce the Government of India to give back our 340 lakhs.”

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR:—“Mr. President, Sir, there is a motion standing against my name the object of which is very much humbler than the one now before the House, and I wish, therefore, to address the House upon this motion that is now before it. The hon. the Revenue Member told us that he had already given reasons which, according to him, were excellent as to why it was that the budget figures should stand as they did with respect to the expenditure that had to be incurred for the settlements during the budget year now under consideration. I am sorry I was

[Mr. L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar] [12th March 1923]

not able to be here when he enlightened the House upon the need for such a large amount being spent upon resettlements. But I heard the few reasons of somewhat weighty import which he gave as to why it was that the settlement figures should stand as they did; and if I address the House this afternoon it is only by way of attempting to combat the reasons that my hon. friend has given as to why it is—anxious as he is like everyone of us to cut down the expenditure on account of settlements and on account of every thing else—he finds that time and history being against him he is unable to give effect to his most strenuous intentions. Now, Sir, the position is this. I dare say that the hon. the Revenue Member will not dissociate himself from the correctness of the explanatory memorandum that is given by the Secretary. We find, opposite to the heading ‘survey and settlements’ the Secretary stating that the decrease in the revised estimate is the net result of a decrease under Revenue Settlements due to one of the settlement parties being engaged on the record of rights in estate lands and then he goes on to point out what the increase in the revenue survey was due to. We are now concerned only with the amount which has been spent on account of the revenue settlements. Now, Sir, if I understand that statement correctly it means this: that whereas in the current year the amount that was budgeted was 8·10 lakhs, the actual amount that has been spent is 6·32 lakhs making a difference of 1·78 lakhs of rupees. Even my hon. friend, who has now become accustomed to deal with figures which are in no instance possibly less than six in number at a time, must grant that the difference of 1·78 lakhs is an appreciable one which he should take note of. Now, Sir, I understand that the reason for this difference was not that there was anything wrong in the original budget, not that there was anything wrong with the actual expenditure, or what is expected to be incurred, but that the parties which were originally intended to do the resettlement work in conformity with the injunctions that time and history have imposed upon us, had been called away from that work to another work which time and history had not imposed upon us the necessity of directing them to. Now what does it mean? It means that originally the settlement parties were thought of for the purpose of carrying on resettlements in some places, that is because the original period of settlement was over; but it is found that estates want the work of these settlement parties and so it is that the resettlement is not undertaken as originally intended with the result that there is a sum of Rs. 1·78 lakhs originally budgeted for not used. If I may be permitted to use that argument for the purpose of understanding the present figures, now that there is a deficit of over 40 lakhs of rupees that is to be met, is it too much to expect that there may be some cut made in the budget for the expenditure on the resettlement in this year so that the deficit might be less and if our resettlement parties could be utilised for estate work so that the original budget need not be conformed to, is it wrong to ask that at least for this year, whatever may happen in the years to come, there need not be so large an expenditure undertaken as is now proposed to be?

“My hon. friend observed that the difference between the figures in the revised estimate for the current year and the budget estimate for the coming year was something like a lakh and a half. That, Sir,—I am an unsophisticated man—appears to me to be a fairly considerable sum and we should not, therefore, submit to the figure as it

3-45 p.m.

12th March 1923]. [Mr. L. A. Goyindaraghava Ayyar]

stands. Now it has been stated that there are considerations which require that resettlement should be undertaken. There is one argument which I have heard at least half a dozen times, if not longer, and that is the delay in making a resettlement in one district means an injury to the settlement of other districts which have also undergone that settlement or resettlement. I must confess I find it somewhat difficult to follow the logic of it. I can as well understand if the argument be this: that there are some districts which are to be favoured but they are not to be favoured at the expense of others. That is the point I should like to lay some stress upon. As my hon. friend has observed the resettlement takes place once in 30 years, so that a district which has been once settled is bound to be resettled at the end of that period; and according to that arrangement, whether resettlement takes place in that district or not does not concern another district which is less fortunately placed than the former. To say, therefore, that an injury has been inflicted upon one district is an argument which we cannot understand.

“Then, Sir, it has been pointed out that there is the rule of time which has to be conformed to. Now, I would ask my hon. friend whether there have not been such delays in the past and how does he account for them? If the reason be that in some cases you can delay the settlement operations, considerations of economy, particularly as they apply to the present juncture, are sufficient reason why you should not insist upon the expenditure on resettlement being quite so high as it is put in the budget. There is one other very weighty reason why this expenditure on resettlement should be reduced as far as possible, and that is that there is a proposal for permanent settlement. But because that is a matter in respect of which an All-India Legislation is necessary and the views of the Government of India have to be obtained, the proposal is not carried into effect. Speaking for myself, it was a tactical mistake—not to call it worse—when a resolution that permanent settlement should be introduced in this province was moved in this House—and my hon. friend pointed out what exactly the risks were that the House was likely to run by accepting that resolution. To that extent I do not quarrel with the position taken up by the hon. Member, but there is an implication which I would like to join issue on. Suppose we had asked when asking for permanent settlement, that principles of settlement should be provided statutorily as recommended by the Joint Committee, should there not be a protest raised on behalf of the Government? As a matter of fact they were bound by the circumstances, to which the Reform Act owes its existence, to put into the Statute Book some kind of Statute which would determine the principles of settlement, and supposing after that had been done, a resolution was carried stating that permanent settlement was the thing which would be acceptable to this province, would it be competent for this House or the Government to say then ‘we are not going to give effect to this resolution?’ The same effect of the process being reversed, it is not to go away from the propriety of the proposition when we say that, until we know where exactly we stand with respect to the principles of settlement which have to be enacted as a Statute, it is better that resettlement is not hurried on and that is exactly one of the purposes which this resolution now before the House is intended to achieve. In these circumstances, it seems to me that the House would be well advised in accepting the motion now before the House, which has been moved by my hon. friend, Mr. Pakkiriswami Pillai.”

[12th March 1923]

MR. E. S. LLOYD :—"It is true that in the memorandum of the budget I have mentioned a decrease in the expenditure under the head of 'Revenue Settlement' in the revised estimate due to one of the parties being engaged on estate work but that does not mean that the provision for next year is excessive. Motions like the present for lump sum reductions in the budget show that the House seems to think that the Board of Revenue and the people in charge of the arrangements of the budget do not know their work. I assure the House that only suitable provision has been made. But it is said that in any case definite cuts have to be effected for the sake of economy. Mr. Govindaraghava Ayyar said that the reduction of expenditure on the preparations for the Tanjore settlement was possible. This seems rather to imply that he wants to delay the resettlement and not to hurry it. In any case, when we have already passed all the details of the principal head in question, it seems to me ridiculous to proceed to cut the total when you come to the final stage."

DIWAN BAHADUR L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—"May I just explain that I am not responsible for the order in which the several motions have been arranged in the agenda."

MR. E. S. LLOYD :—"I quite see that the hon. gentleman had not a chance. The fact remains however that the House was satisfied with the details of the particular portion of the budget in question. Now when we come to the final stage, to say that though the details are satisfactory there should be a reduction in the total seems to me to be an illogical conclusion."

"In this connexion I am authorized to say that our prospects are rather better than when the budget was prepared. For instance, the report of the arrack sales has just now come and shows a gratifying increase of about six lakhs. That is something on the right side. Then there is a small matter of Rs. 25,000 which we are to get as duty on Bangalore beer coming into the Madras Presidency as a result of the arrangements made with the hon. the Resident in Mysore. Another more important matter is that we are going to get from the Government of India for the work done for them in connexion with income-tax a large sum of over five lakhs of rupees for the year 1921-22, and we may count upon another sum of about five lakhs for the two years 1922-23 and 1923-24. Income-tax has now become a central subject and therefore any work that we do in connexion with it should be paid for by the Government of India. That gives us another ten lakhs of rupees. Then again, Sir, we have a demand for a portion of the charge on Railway police. We have been negotiating with the Government of India on this matter for quite a long time, and they have now undertaken to bear a portion of the cost for the Railway police for the years 1921-22, 1922-23 and 1923-24. The exact figures have not yet been settled, but we can assume that the assignment will not be less than $3\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of rupees per year. Thus there is another ten lakhs of rupees coming under that head. Again, of course, as we know, there is retrenchment everywhere, and undoubtedly we are going to get something out of that. Altogether what with the amount we expect to receive from the Government of India and from other sources we anticipate—mind it is only anticipation—that before the end of next year our position will improve to the extent of nearly 30 lakhs. This will go a great way towards meeting the dead-weight debt. Therefore, I do not think it is quite good policy to attempt to make any haphazard cuts in the totals of demands to the details of which the House has already agreed."

12th March 1923]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, there is only one word in connexion with the settlement which I would like to say for the information of my hon. friend, Mr. Govindaraghava Ayyar, as I think he was not here at the time I read out the figures justifying the total amount of expenditure under that head. He drew attention to the fact that during the current year the amount that we had intended to spend was not spent, that it was therefore a saving, that that saving was due to the fact that one of our settlement parties which was intended to be kept busy on Government work was actually busy on estate work, and that therefore there might be a similar chance for our not utilizing the amount that we have allotted for the coming year. On that ground I suppose, he advises us to budget for a lesser amount. I have already given complete details of the working of the settlement parties. The most important work on which they are going to be busy is the resettlement in the districts of Tanjore and Trichinopoly. The provision of larger expenditure is on account of these two districts for the settlements of which operations have already begun. It is absolutely necessary that these operations should be completed in the course of the next year."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—"May I ask for the figures in respect of the resettlement of these two districts?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"The figure that was specifically referred to was Rs. 3,25,000, and I have already stated that that increase is due to the fact that we have to spend next year for the settlement operations in Tanjore, Vizagapatam, Malabar, Wynad, etc., and that therefore the allotment in the budget for the current year was increased by nearly a lakh. I already explained all the figures when each item was discussed, and we had then decided that there was justification for the increase under each head. Wherever an increase occurred, the increase was challenged by means of a particular motion, but the House was satisfied with the reasons which I urged in justification of such increases. All these put together now lead to this total, and as pointed out by my hon. friend, Mr. Lloyd, after having allowed me to retain under each particular item the provision that was asked for, and when I am at the end of my labours, to say that the total should be reduced by a sum of Rs. 70,000, seems to me unfair. Of course, my hon. friend has asked for a reduction, not of Rs. 70,000, but only Rs. 1,000."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—"That is because I wanted to draw the attention of the Government to the irregularities or what I consider to be the defects of the administration."

MR. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—"After hearing all the explanations given by the hon. the Revenue Member, I must confess
 4 p.m. I do not find the necessity for entertaining two probationers in the coming year. Not satisfied with the two temporary Assistant Directors, this new addition has been made. If we go on in this way, where is the chance of our saving? So, I hope the House will accept the motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"I am asked, Sir, at this late hour in the day to justify once more why provision has been made for two temporary Assistant Directors. I had discussed that question in the previous motion and tried to convince the House that they were for the purpose of a temporary party which was

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] '[12th March 1923

intended to do a much larger amount of work than was done in the current year. I said also that that was the procedure which was being followed in the Survey Department. We have five parties at our disposal, and every extra work is done by means of temporary parties and the number of temporary parties and officers manning them invariably depends upon the quantity of work to be done. According to the quantity of work to be done next year, we want these two special Assistant Directors."

The motion was put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded and the House divided as follows:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 7. Mr. M. Narayanaswami Reddi. |
| 2. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi. | 8. " V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai. |
| 3. " M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu. | 9. " T. Somasundara Mudaliyar. |
| 4. Rao Bahadur P. C. Ethirajula Nayudu. | 10. Diwan Bahadur L. A. Govindaraghava Ayyar. |
| 5. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu. | 11. Mr. M. Suryanarayana. |
| 6. " A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiyar. | |

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 19. Diwan Bahadur K. Suryanarayanamurti Nayudu. |
| 2. " Khan Bahadur Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur. | 20. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. |
| 3. " the Raja of Kanagal. | 21. Diwan Bahadur M. Venkataratnam Nayudu. |
| 4. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkatarreddi Nayudu. | 22. Mr. S. Muttumanikkachariyar. |
| 5. " Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 23. Rai Sahib E. C. M. Mascarenhas. |
| 6. " Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 24. Mr. A. T. Palmer. |
| 7. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. | 25. " M. Ratnaswami. |
| 8. " C. Madhavan Nayar. | 26. " C. R. T. Congreave. |
| 9. " E. S. Lloyd. | 27. Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abdul Razaq Sahib. |
| 10. Diwan Bahadur T. Sivagnanam Pillai. | 28. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib. |
| 11. Mr. E. F. Thomas. | 29. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib. |
| 12. " E. Periyannayagam. | 30. Mr. L. C. Guruswami. |
| 13. Rao Sahib T. C. Tangavelu Pillai. | 31. Rao Sahib M. C. Madurai Pillai. |
| 14. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai. | 32. Rao Sahib P. Venkatarangayya. |
| 15. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu. | 33. Mr. A. J. Leech. |
| 16. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar. | 34. " A. M. MacDougall. |
| 17. Rao Bahadur O. Tanikachala Chettiyar. | 35. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chettiyar. |
| 18. Rao Bahadur N. Ramayya Punja. | |

Eleven voted for the motion and 35 against it; the motion was lost.

MOTION No. 25.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 9,45,000 for Revenue Settlement by 100.

In doing so I should like to mention to the House how it is possible to reduce the expenditure under Survey and Settlement to a considerable extent. Sir, the settlement has to be conducted on certain principles. An economic enquiry into the conditions of the tract is made; the value of the lands is reckoned; the increase or decrease in population is worked out, and so on and so on. I should like to know from the hon. the Revenue Member whether it is necessary to have the present costly establishment for obtaining these information. He has passed orders on various settlements and his predecessors have passed orders on previous settlements. What is the principle on which these orders have been passed? In almost all these cases the one consideration by which they were guided was

12th March 1923] [Mr A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

the increase or the decrease in prices of food grains during the previous twenty normal years. If that is so, what particular object is gained by having this costly establishment and trying to obtain information which very often they are already in possession of? Take, for example, the economic condition of the tract. The Collector sends the *jamabandi* report. Once in ten years the decennial report is received. All these reports will give the necessary information. The famine report will be submitted from the unfortunate areas where famines occur. The census reports published once in ten years will tell you whether the population has increased or decreased. Recently a resolution was carried in the Legislative Assembly for the collection and maintenance of agricultural statistics. That again will furnish information regarding the agricultural prosperity of the tract. When you have facilities for obtaining all these informations, what is the necessity for having this huge establishment? Take the old settlements and see by what percentage you have made enhancements and what relation it bears to the increase in the price of food stuffs. Then you can fix a certain percentage by which any enhancement of land tax may be made. If some such principle is evolved there will be no need for any costly machinery. In order to raise this subject, I have brought this motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I am thankful, Sir, to the hon. Member for the suggestions he has made for my information and—shall I also add?—for my edification. I quite see that the modern system of effecting resettlements is more or less percentage enhancement of the tax previously in force. There are certain preliminaries to be gone through before the local authorities can make up their minds as to what that particular percentage should be. The percentage cannot be worked out by any rule of the thumb nor can it be worked at the Secretariat, at the office table. Detailed figures have to be gathered relating to the district and a very careful inquiry has to be conducted as regards the economic condition of the district before it can be decided whether that particular district can bear any additional taxation or not. Our predecessors in this House, at any rate, have been constantly urging on the attention of the Government the necessity for conducting elaborate economic enquiries. Various orders for conducting detailed economic enquiries have been passed as a preliminary step to the conduct of the resettlement. I may invite the attention of the House to the fact that I placed this very question before a Committee, which I summoned the other day, called the Committee for making suggestions in regard to the Conduct of Surveys and Settlements. Their report was laid on the table of the House. I asked them definite questions, and the seventh question was whether they could suggest any method by which the process of resettlement of the assessment could be determined. The conclusion they arrived at was that they regretted that besides the suggestions in answer to question 5 they were unable to suggest economies in any other direction, nor the substitution of the present system by any other. That, Sir, is the suggestion of the Committee which went into the question very thoroughly, and very elaborately in order to evolve a process cheaper without at the same time being less efficient. I deliberately summoned that Committee in order to give me some suggestions and they were of this opinion. My hon. friend opposite is a member of the Retrenchment Committee and I think if he can give any new suggestions I shall be grateful to him."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[12th March 1923]

MOTION No. 26.

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI:—"I move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 21,71,222 for Survey and Settlement by Rs. 20,00,000.

My hon. friend or anybody might have been alarmed at the amount proposed to be reduced. Many of the motions that have preceded mine have dealt with a large portion of the question. In view of the economic stringency and the deficit facing us I think we should do much more. But after hearing the explanations of my hon. friend and the arguments advanced in respect of the other motions and what is still more after hearing Mr. Lloyd who said that the Government of India is going to give us thirty lakhs I think we can meet a large portion of the deficit and we can confidently work the budget to a satisfactory progress in all directions.

"My object, Sir, in bringing forward this motion is to elicit information from the hon. the Revenue Member on two important points.
4-15 p.m.

One is about the re-organization of the Revenue Board, for which a committee was appointed, which submitted its report to the Government. What has been done with regard to that, what action has been taken by the Government on the report of the committee, we do not know. No definite information has been laid before the House by the department concerned. Another question is about the proposal at any rate I made the proposal—that the Revenue and the Settlement departments must work together, that the settlement work must be amalgamated with the revenue work. Instead of two departments working, there must be only one department.

"Another question is about the Settlement Bill which was intended to embody the principles of settlement. A committee was also appointed with regard to this matter and I was a member of that committee. The committee submitted its report and nothing has been done with regard to the report. What action has been taken on the report, we do not know. Probably the Government is in correspondence with the higher authorities. Therefore, while introducing legislation embodying principles of settlement, what is important is a consideration of the permanent settlement in the ryotwari area. There was also a resolution passed by this Council to the effect that, as soon as possible, introduction of permanent settlement in the ryotwari villages in this Presidency should be considered. What I stated was that settlement operations must be stopped once for all, because if we go on taking one district after another for resettlement, there will be no end to it and even after sanction has been obtained for the introduction of the permanent settlement, it will be difficult to introduce it. I proposed that the figures of the last settlement might be taken as the criterion and that no new resettlement must be made until sanction has been received for the introduction of the permanent settlement, and till then all the districts, settled or unsettled, must lie over. There should be no new resettlement now until the sanction for the introduction of permanent settlement is received. That will enable us to introduce permanent settlement without inequality and we can fix the rates by taking the prices during the previous twenty non-famine years into consideration and striking an average for the whole Presidency. There is no chance of ever bringing into operation or introducing permanent settlement at all if we go on taking each district for resettlement at the end of every 30 years. On these questions, I ask the hon. the Revenue Member to give me definite information."

12th March 1923]

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"I must confess, Sir, that I have recovered from the shock which this particular motion had inflicted upon me when I saw that my hon. friend was proposing to knock out so much as Rs. 20,00,000 out of an allotment of Rs. 21,71,222; he now assures me that he did not intend to produce that shock in me but he only wanted to elicit certain information from me; and I am indeed glad to furnish that information to him. He asks me the same question which, I think, was asked by my hon. friend opposite a little while ago, as to what had happened to the proposed Settlement Bill, and why no effect has been given to the permanent settlement resolution. My hon. friend with his wide and varied experience of the Revenue Department gives me a few hints as to how the permanent settlement could be facilitated in this province and I am certainly willing to accept them from him. What I can say at this stage is that, soon after the resolution with regard to the permanent settlement in this province was passed, the Bill which had been drafted by the Government and which ought to have been in the usual course introduced in this House and which naturally aimed at a different purpose, namely, periodical settlement, had to be stopped until the decision of the Government of India and, for the matter of that, the Secretary of State, was previously ascertained as to what chances there were of introducing permanent settlement in this province. We were guilty of no delay in immediately transmitting to the Government of India the correspondence; and I may inform the House that until this minute no reply has been received from the Government of India to our correspondence."

Diwan Bahadur L. A. GOVINDARAGHAVA AYYAR :—"Were any reminders sent?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"I believe they were."

"Therefore, the hon. Member will see that neither I nor the Government of which I have the honour to be a member, have in any way discourteously treated the resolution of this House recommending permanent settlement. He will also see that the reason why the local Government could not introduce the Bill, which was ready at that time, is on account of the divergent expression of opinion. He gives me, Sir, a very large order when he asks me to stop all settlement operations in this province. Probably the announcement which was made by the hon. the Finance Secretary has emboldened him to do so, for he has just now told us that there is every prospect of the budget of next year balancing itself. But may I ask him, Sir, whether if the resettlement operations in the Tanjore and Trichinopoly districts are not going to be given effect to, there is still hope of the balancing of the budget? The balancing of the budget is dependent on certain revenue from this source and if this item of revenue is withdrawn, there may be no balancing of the budget in spite of these windfalls contained in the announcement just now made by my hon. friend Mr. Lloyd."

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—"Is it because the resettlement in these districts yields larger revenue, that we must go on with resettlement of district after district irrespective of the consideration that we may receive the sanction of the Government of India or the Secretary of State?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"So the revenue of a province cannot be made to suffer on the off-chance of a system now in vogue being possibly altered later by something

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] * [12th March 1923]

which we expect but of which we are not at the present moment certain. Resettlement operations must necessarily go on and we cannot deprive ourselves of our revenue. I was certainly amazed when I heard the hon. Member complain that he did not at all know as to what happened about the Board of Revenue Committee of which he was a member and where he gave us very valuable assistance indeed. The report of that Committee, Sir, was laid on the table of this House. The action taken by the Government was also laid on the table of the House. We accepted the recommendations of the Committee. We abolished the post of one Secretary which the Committee had suggested. We wrote to the Government of India, and probably the matter is now in the hands of the Secretary of State because it involves the abolition of the post of an I.C.S. officer. All the recommendations made by the Committee with regard to the economies to be carried out by the Board of Revenue as a result of the combination of the survey and settlement departments were immediately given effect to and those economies appeared up in the budget not only of the next year but even of this year. What more should have been done, I cannot understand. I have given the information to the hon. Member in the best manner that I could have done."

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—" I do not know if any reorganization of the Board has been made."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The hon. Member must make up his mind either to press his motion to a division or to withdraw it."

Mr. S. T. SHANMUKHAM PILLAI :—" Sir I am satisfied with what explanation and information the hon. Member could possibly give and has now given and now I beg leave to withdraw it."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 27.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—" Sir, I beg to move—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,22,640 for special pay.

" I understand that the revenue inspectors and others are engaged on the collection of agricultural statistics. I do not see any necessity for giving them any special pay or allowance."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" The previous system relating to the revenue inspectors was that they represented separate cadres by themselves. There were two grades of revenue inspectors. Now we have what is called the Knapp's scheme, of which my hon. colleague was the author. The necessity of keeping separate cadres, the fixation of their pay, the fixation of time-scales, were all considered by him.

" According to the recommendations of the Knapp scheme, revenue inspectors are no longer treated as a separate entity ; but they are to be merged in the cadre of clerks. There are two classes of clerks, one class drawing Rs. 35 to Rs. 60 and another Rs. 60 to Rs. 80. The revenue inspectors must merge either in the lower scale or in the higher scale according to the nature of pay that they were drawing at the time they are so merged. We have therefore kept a certain number in the higher scale and a certain number in the lower scale. A man on Rs. 35 sitting at his desk and doing the job has no out-door work at all, nor has he got that responsibility which the revenue inspector has. Therefore the proposal was that from among the clerks men should be posted out as revenue inspectors, and

4-30 p.m.

12th March 1923] [Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib]

when they are so posted they must draw the pay of the clerical rank and a special pay of Rs. 10. This gave them a certain advantage. If a clerk was marked out at an early stage of his life as being specially intelligent and likely to make a good pull-up in his life, he was selected and trained as a revenue inspector and posted definitely to a particular firka. The pay that he drew as a clerk would hardly be sufficient to enable him to take up that place and therefore he is given this Rs. 10 in addition. There is another advantage. Under the old system, when a revenue inspector misbehaved or did his work badly

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"Sir, I withdraw my motion."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"The hon. the Revenue Member is entitled to finish his speech. You cannot withdraw if the hon. the Revenue Member is willing to go on with his speech."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Not at all, Sir."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 28.

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—"I beg to move—

To omit the allotment of Rs. 82,080 for assistant karnams.

Sir, this is a motion affecting the salary of assistant karnams. The amount is not very big, but the policy of maintaining assistant karnams seems to be unnecessary. Most of the karnam's work is such that it has to be done only by one. For instance, the adangal and similar accounts cannot be divided between two people. I think without the assistant karnams the head karnam can very well manage the business. So, in my opinion, the assistant karnams can be dispensed with and their pay either saved or added to a certain extent to pay of the head karnams."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"I admit I have been one of those who have been under the impression that these assistant karnams are more a burden in a village than a necessity, and with that view I have been pressing to reduce the number of these functionaries. During the current year we had 1,117 assistant karnams, and in the course of the year we have been able to send away no less than 579 of them. According to the figures now in my hands, the Board of Revenue have proposed to reduce another 83 men in the next year. That is, altogether 662 of them shall have disappeared. But there are certain cases in which there would be necessity to have more than one karnam, according to the volume of work to be done, where particularly irrigation cess has got to be collected in large amount. Therefore, I am examining the case as to whether assistant karnams should exist and if so where they should exist. That has been, Sir, my own aim and I am thankful that my friend is of this opinion."

This motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 29.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—"I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 34,66,704 for executive subordinates by Rs. 100.

Sir, I just want to make this motion which, as the hon. the Finance Member said, is one of those motions made with a view to obtaining information rather than making any real cut. What I may say will lead to additional

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [12th March 1923]

increment rather than reduction. We will have no time to-day to go into the question of general administration and so the hon. the Revenue Member will have nothing to say in reply on this subject. So far as the reduction of villages is concerned, I want to know whether the hon. the Revenue Member would consider the desirability of stopping any further reduction. At the time of the general discussion, a large number of Members referred to this question, namely, that the Government is having too much of these reductions. The hon. the Revenue Member has told us that the number of assistant karnams would practically be reduced and eventually made to disappear very soon. Only two years ago, a number of Collectors have reported that several villages should be divided and the number of village officers should be increased. Now, I ask whether it is desirable for retrenchment purposes to reduce the number of villages and re-group them. We know, Sir, that this is causing the public a good deal of hardship. I, therefore, ask the Government to seriously consider the matter whether they have not come to a stage when further retrenchment and further re-grouping of villages would not be possible.

"One other point. With reference to clerks who are revenue inspectors, the hon. the Revenue Member has expressed much sympathy for them. As regards the travelling allowances, under the rule of general sacrifice to which the revenue inspectors also succumbed, they would not get any travelling allowances within five miles. I understand that the rule will be changed so far as the revenue inspectors are concerned. But I want to know definitely whether the rule has been modified and whether instructions have issued to the various Collectors exempting revenue inspectors from this five-mile jurisdiction. As it is, a revenue inspector will get no travelling allowance for the trips he takes within five miles. So I want a definite statement on that point.

"Then as regards the increment. There have been complaints from many clerks that they did not get in time the first year's increment though they became entitled to it, and that the Collectors would not allow them to draw it. Therefore, I ask whether instructions have been issued to the Collectors on this point also that increments should be given from year to year without any reference to the Finance Department or any higher authorities. These are the few points that I wanted to place before the House and I will be glad if the hon. the Revenue Member will enlighten us on those points."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"Sir, as regards the first point, namely, the re-grouping of the villages, it is certainly being carried on in the whole Presidency at the present moment. The question was raised during the course of the general debate on the budget the other day and I told them that I felt my position very awkward inasmuch as on the one hand I was pressed for economy of expenditure and the moment I set any machinery in operation for the purpose of economising, I was at once told to halt. It seemed to me, Sir, that one single item which was capable of a good deal of economy was the item relating to the salaries of the village officials. I do not say that I have no sympathy for them. I think I have, times out of number, shown my sympathy to the best of my ability and I have increased their salaries and have done everything that I can possibly do. When everything is said and done, it must be confessed that they are swallowing up a very big portion of the land revenue expenditure which I have to ask sanction for from the House. I am constantly told that the item which I have to ask this House to sanction is by crores. But I

12th March 1923] [Sir Muḥammad Ḥabīb-ul-lāḥ Ṣahīb]

want at once to tell the House that if I am asking for crores, a large part of that is due to the village officers. The whole cost of village officers amounts to Rs. 1,24,79,896. So when I saw that such a large portion of expenditure under Administration was being incurred in that direction my tendencies naturally went towards searching for any possible economies. I was advised by those whose advice I have to respect that there was a chance of economising in this direction, not of course by reducing their salaries, but by reducing the number, and I was told that there were certain minor villages where it was not worth while to maintain separate establishments, and that by grouping them along with some other villages, a good deal of economy could be achieved. Therefore, I asked the Board of Revenue to proceed in that direction and so far I think the Board of Revenue have not been able to accomplish more economies than to the extent of 8 to 9 lakhs in the current year. But they hope to effect another economy in the course of the next year, I believe, of 8 or 9 lakhs. I do not think that we are going to achieve a larger economy than 16 to 17 lakhs on the whole out of an expenditure of 124 lakhs. But there is one aspect which is likely to be misunderstood. I am certainly quite willing to see that the village establishments are not abolished where they are necessary. This will be done only when no inconvenience is caused to the public and when by such re-grouping no more work than could possibly be done by a single village official is thrown upon his shoulders.

"Then, there is the question asked of me as regards the Revenue Inspectors' travelling allowance. It is true that the old rule was that the five mile limit did not apply to these people. But under the new revised travelling allowance rules, that concession ceased to apply to the Revenue Inspectors. We are now examining that question and probably the conclusion that we may reach will be that rather than giving him a daily allowance, it will be far preferable to give him a fixed travelling allowance. We are working out the details as regards what the reasonable amount of the fixed travelling allowance will be in the case of the Revenue Inspector so that he can travel and maintain an honest diary unhampered by rigidity of rules.

"Then, Sir, as regards the increment about which my hon. friend has stated that some Collectors have withheld some increments, I am aware of no such cases, and no such complaint has ever reached me."

4-45 p.m.
Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"No increments were allowed after one year."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, as regards the date from which certain scales of salaries have to be given effect to some inquiries had to be made and the financial position had to be ascertained and the date from which the scale would take effect was mentioned in the order sanctioning the time-scale. And I do not think any Collector after he got the sanction for a particular incremental scale with effect from a particular date ever withheld the increment in the case of any official. I am not aware of the exact position of affairs which my hon. friend is referring to. But if he will be so good as to draw my attention to any particular case where there has been a real hardship, I am quite prepared to investigate into the matter. Probably, the real reason of the complaint is that as soon as the scale was introduced there was no increment provided for in the very first year. The time-scale begins with 35, and after one year for which no increase is contemplated, it goes by annual increments of 1½.

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]

That probably is the reason why there was not any increment as soon as the scale was sanctioned. But as I said, I am not familiar with the facts which my hon. friend refers to and I will be quite ready to investigate into the matter if he informs me of any case."

MR. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—"I do not want to say anything except a word or two about the increments to clerks. The scale fixed is 35—1 $\frac{1}{2}$ —50. As soon as the first year was over the clerks thought that they should have got Rs. 36 $\frac{1}{2}$. This was not given as soon as the year was over. As for the reduction in the number of village officers, a sympathetic reply has been given by the hon. the Revenue Member. I think the hon. Member will remember that revenue monigars have gone, assistant karnams have to go and that the work that was done by a number of people is being done only by two officers now. Therefore any further reduction will be a substantial burden upon them. With these words, I beg to withdraw my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 30.

MR. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Sir, I beg to move—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,61,180 for village establishment by 100.

I move this motion just to have an idea of what the Government intend to do in regard to the village officers in zamindari areas. Sir, in regard to the village officers in Government areas, their pay has been raised to Rs. 15 both in the case of the munsif and the karnam. But in the case of the proprietary estates and zamindari areas, the pay of the headmen is only Rs. 8 and that of karnam ranges from Rs. 8 to Rs. 15. I want to ask in what respect the village officers in zamindari areas deserve to be paid less. Is it because that the village officers in revenue villages are directly under the Government that they are treated more liberally by the Government? If it is a case in which the village officer has to work directly under the zamindar himself without any responsibility to or control by Government, I can understand his being paid less. But the village officer in zamindari areas has more onerous duties to discharge. While the village officer in ryotwari areas serves under only one master, the village officer in zamin village has to serve under two, the zamindar and the Government. He has to attend to the duties of the proprietor and the duties of the Government. When a proprietor or his agent or subordinate finds fault with him, and files a complaint, he has to defend himself. In the case of the village officer in the ryotwari areas there is no such risk at all. The village officers in the zamindari areas have therefore to please two masters. If charges are framed against them they are punished by the Collector. Some proprietors harass them with complaints which they have to answer. The duties being onerous, the responsibilities being greater, these officers deserve at least equal pay. All that can be said against giving them the same pay is that in the ryotwari area the village officers are paid out of the revenues of Government while in the zamindari area the ryots do not directly pay but what the Government get is the permanent *peshkash*. If such an argument is advanced, that the zamindars should provide for the increase of pay; there must be some rule under which the proprietors can be asked to pay. There is absolutely no reason why these officers should be asked to work for the proprietor and

12th March 1923]

[Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu]

should receive less pay. In the Salaries Committee Report it was stated that the pay of these officers was sufficient having regard to the work that they had to do to the Government. If that is the rule to be observed in fixing the pay, then these officers should be held responsible only to Government for the pay that they receive and should be given the freedom to stipulate for further payment with the zamindar for the work that they do for him. If the zamindar is not willing to pay, then he may choose his own collection officer and not have the services of this Government official. I may also draw the attention of the House, Sir, to the fact that about one-third of the total number of karnams are in the zamindari areas. Their case deserves the sympathy of the Government. I move this proposition only to find out the policy of the Government, whether the Government would insist, as heretofore that the village officers in zamindari areas should do the duties of both the Government and the zamindar, or whether for the pay that they now receive they would be held responsible only to the Government. Act II of 1894 lays down that they shall do the duties entrusted to them by the proprietor. If the officers are to do all the duties but should not expect to be paid, it is certainly an anomaly. In the interests of these officials whose work is onerous and whose responsibilities are great, I submit that they should be given as much pay as the officials in the ryotwari areas or be allowed to stipulate for payment with the proprietors."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" Sir I am glad the hon. Member himself has referred to the very elaborate discussion of this question by the Salaries Committee. They have very definitely pointed out in their report, of course after a very elaborate examination of the nature of the duties which village officials in the proprietary areas perform, that the salaries then given to them were considered amply sufficient. But times have absolutely changed and the salaries that are now being paid to the proprietary village officials are much more than what they were paid formerly. It is wrong to imagine that the nature of the duties performed by the village officials in the ryotwari areas and those performed by the village officials in the proprietary areas are identical. The nature of the duties performed by the former is certainly more onerous than in the latter case where the Government derive only a fraction of the help. It may be that the officials in the zamindari areas are doing some work for the proprietors as indeed they are bound to do, but that will not certainly be a justification for taxing the general taxpayer with a large expenditure on account of increasing their salaries. I therefore say, Sir, that the salaries which were recently revised are amply sufficient and the Government have no intention whatsoever of increasing them at all in the future. If the proposal which I had made before this House some time ago for the purpose of restoration of the village service cess had been accepted then probably it might have been possible to consider this question favourably. But unfortunately that was thrown out and the entire burden for the payment of the village officers in proprietary areas now falls on the shoulders of the general taxpayer. In the proprietary areas the House will notice that we are now spending about 26 lakhs of rupees in the shape of salaries to village officials. And that, Sir, is a large slice out of the revenues of the province for the nature and the extent of duties which these officials perform. I do not think I can hold out any hope that I will consider favourably the question of increasing the salaries any more."

[12th March 1923]

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—" Mr. President, what my hon. friend from Chittoor has said, would leave an impression that the Government are paying the village officers in proprietary estates out of their revenues for doing proprietors' work. May I just point out that these officials are paid mainly from the inams resumed by Government? The proprietors never wanted the Government resuming the inams and paying the village officers inadequate amount of salary. If the Government cannot pay them adequately, the best course for them would be to disenfranchise the inams, restore them to the proprietors and ask them and the village officials to settle their own terms."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—" I thought, Sir, the hon. Member for Revenue would say something about the policy of the Government with regard to the duties performed by the village officers in proprietary estates. My main complaint is this. The pay that they now receive is said to be enough and even more for the work they do which the hon. Member said is only a fraction. But I ask what about the duty that they are insisted upon to do, on pain of being dismissed, to the zamindars. Are they allowed to stipulate for payment with the zamindars? I would request the hon. Member to consider this aspect of the case. It is hard upon the official if the zamindar were to say that the inam is enfranchised and that, therefore, he need not pay and if the Government were to say that they are not responsible. I am only voicing the sentiments of the officials that there is no reason why the Government should assume control over them and deny the responsibility for paying them. I expect a reply from the hon. Member."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—" First in regard to the criticism of my hon. friend, the Raja Sahib, I may at once tell him that the total realized from the inams to which reference has been made is no more than six lakhs. The total expenditure under this head is somewhere about 27 lakhs. What exactly goes out of the tax-payer's money is over twenty lakhs. It is not quite correct to say that Government are realizing revenue in one shape or other and are paying it back to these men. It is not so at all. We are not realizing even one-third of the total amount that we pay to the proprietary village officers."

"Then, Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Muniswami Nayudu, again presses that I should tell him definitely what I intend doing with regard to the nature of the duties of the village officers. I think, Sir, my own impression of course gathered from the reports made to me is that both the duties together—the duties which the proprietary village officials perform on behalf of Government and which they perform on behalf of the proprietors—that both the duties put together are not certainly equal to the duties performed by the officers in the ryotwari areas. If, therefore, the latter are paid a little more than the former, I do not think that there can be any argument raised that they are underpaid. My hon. friend has told us that they are serving under two masters. The answer lies in that very statement. Those who serve under two masters do no work under either. The salary that they get is not at all out of any proportion to their work. The hon. Member wants me to examine whether they could be relieved of the duties which they perform on behalf of the proprietors. There was some proposal that we should withdraw absolutely from payment to the proprietary village officials. The question was not completely and exhaustively examined, and if my hon. friend wants me to go into it I shall do so."

12th March 1923]

5 p.m.

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"Sir, the hon. the Revenue Member has stated that the actual amount realized from the inams is about 6 lakhs and that the expenditure incurred would be somewhere about 27 lakhs. I would only like to say that the work turned out by these village officers also would be in that proportion, because they are working both for the Government and for the proprietors."

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU:—"Sir, I must differ from the hon. the Revenue Member in regard to the statement he has made that the work done by the village officers in question both to the proprietors and to the Government is much less than that of the village officers in ryotwari areas. But I am quite sure that after the enquiry which the hon. the Revenue Member has promised to make, he will be satisfied that the work of the village officers in the proprietary villages is more than that in Government villages, and that the case of the former deserves special treatment. As the hon. the Revenue Member has promised to make an enquiry into the matter, I do not want to press my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

MOTION No. 31.

MR. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI:—"Mr. President, Sir, (Speech inaudible.) I beg to move the following reduction which stands against my name:—

To reduce the allotment of Rs. 45,41,400 for establishment for preparing revenue and agricultural statistics by Rs. 10,00,000.

My object in making this motion is to show that there are a large number of karnams. Their number is stated to be 6,920. We may take it that for almost every village there is a karnam. The work which the karnams have got to do is submitting returns for statistical purposes every now and then and also submitting progress reports of cultivation, crops, etc. These reports are prepared not on actual information obtained and its truth ascertained, but only from the records available for the previous years. After they submit these returns, they have very little work, except casual work. Even with regard to reports showing the actual extent of land under cultivation of some crop or other, the karnams prepare them from the reports of the previous years. From these facts, I think that a karnam can easily look after two villages, and I do not also think that he will grudge it. It is known to everybody that the karnams want and get mamuls at the rate of so much for a pattadar or otherwise, and if the karnam is asked to look after one more village, he would like it all the more because he looks forward to earning something more for himself, and by such means there would also be a saving to Government as well. Besides, he has very little work practically, and he has so much leisure that he attends to many other things. For instance, in every village there is lot of litigation and the karnam invariably takes up one side or the other in each case, and the parties will be paying him something. If the hon. the Revenue Member promises to look into the matter and see that steps are taken to reduce the number of karnams, so that one man may look after two villages, I will not press my motion."

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"Sir, this is a motion of a type exactly opposite to the one which a few minutes ago had been urged in this House by my hon. friend from Coimbatore, who took me to task for going on rather mercilessly with the proposals relating to the regrouping of villages and the reduction in the village establishments. But my hon. friend coming from Tanjore tells me that I have been

[Sir Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [12th March 1923]

rather slow in that process and he offers me a present of as much as Rs. 10,00,000 in the matter of the reduction of the number of karnams. Well, I am really thankful to him for showing me this mine of wealth (Laughter), and if he would permit me to go on at this rate of retrenchment in the village establishments, I for one would certainly be glad. I have already told the House that I regard the present number as high and if the House also feels that it is very high and if they give me definite instructions that I should cut out Rs. 10,00,000 from the amount budgeted for the pay of karnams, I am quite prepared to carry out the mandate."

MR. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI:—"May I say, Sir, that by asking each karnam to look after two villages, such amount can be saved?"

The hon. Khan Bahadur Sir MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I have already told the House that the amalgamation of the villages is being carried on not merely in respect of the village headmen, but in respect of the village karnams as well. Wherever regrouping of villages is carried on, one set of officials disappears according to the amount of work done in such villages, and this includes the karnam also. The assistant karnams have already been abolished to a very large extent in the course of the year and the Board of Revenue promises to carry out further reductions in the course of the next year also. If the hon. Member wishes to have figures in regard to these matters, I shall gladly furnish them to him. As regards karnams, we have already carried out reductions to the extent of 279 in the current year and in the next year we also propose to carry out a much larger reduction among the number of karnams. Well, after all is said and done, it is not quite correct to say that the karnam is a superfluity in a village. I regard the karnam's work as even more important from the statistical point of view at any rate than that of the village headman. The karnam is a clerk of the village headman as it were. If the headman is left by himself, I do not think he would be able to do the work. We have also got the village courts, and the karnam is the clerk of the village court also. He is to furnish various kinds of very important statistical information. I cannot therefore go on ruthlessly abolishing the karnams' places and rendering the administration absolutely paralytic, but I can assure the hon. Member that with the question of the regrouping of villages, the question of the reduction, and that a decent reduction, in the number of the village establishments including karnam, is now going on and in process of operation. During the current year we have carried out a large number of reductions and in the next year we hope to carry out no less reductions. So, Sir, if, without cutting it down to any particular amount, I am permitted to go on with my work, it would be indeed desirable."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

It being ten minutes past 5 o'clock, the demand No. I under Land Revenue for a grant of a sum of Rs. 252'90 lakhs *minus* the deductions already carried by the House, was then put and carried. The grant was accordingly made, namely, Rs. 252'90 lakhs *minus* the reductions made by the House already under the head 'Land Revenue.'

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. the next day.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.